DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 397 EA 014 495

TITLE Oversight Hearing on National Institute of Education. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 81

NOTE 205p.; Not available in paper copy due to small print of original document. Pages 117-200 may not reproduce due to small size of print.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; Federal Aid; *Information Centers; *Information Dissemination; Research and Development Centers; Research Projects; *Research Utilization

IDENTIFIERS *National Institute of Education

ABSTRACT

The testimony, prepared statements, letters, and reports included in this document were presented during and after hearings held June 18, 1981, on proposed reductions in the budget of the National Institute of Education (NIE). Professional educators, administrators, and teacher educators testified on NIE's current and future activities. Criticisms of NIE voiced at the hearing included the low quality of some NIE-supported research, NIE's use of a small number of educational research centers and laboratories, and an alleged tendency for NIE research to be aimed at teacher educators. Positive comments pointed to the usefulnesss of NIE research in a wide range of areas and the helpfulness of NIE's information dissemination activities, such as the ERIC system. Letters and supplementary materials submitted in response to the hearing contributed further to the discussion of criticisms of the NIE. A response by NIE acting diretor Milton Goldberg to questions from the subcommittee chairperson includes, among other items, descriptive lists of NIE's fiscal 1981 contract and grant awards and of NIE's 17 research centers and laboratories as well as a chart of the centers' fiscal 1981 funding from NIE and other sources. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED215397

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON JUNE 18, 1981

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

EA 014 495

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
82-374 O WASHINGTON: 1981

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
TED WEISS, New York
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
HAROLD WASHINGTON, Illinois
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio

JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
KEN KRAMER, Colorado
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MILLICENT FENWICK, New Jersey
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
EUGENE JOHNSTON, North Carolina
LAWRENCE J. DeNARDIS, Connecticut
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
WENDELL BAILEY, Missouri

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

GEORGE MILLER, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
PAUL SIMON, Illinois, *Chairman*
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky
(Ex Officio)

ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WENDELL BAILEY, Missouri
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on June 18, 1981	1
Statement of:	
Anderson, Richard C., director, Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	39
Bader, Lois, Ph. D., professor, College of Education, Michigan State University	3
Emans, Robert, Ph. D., professor, associate dean, School of Education, College of William and Mary	6
Goldberg, Milton, Ph. D. acting director, National Institute of Education	20
Greene, Maxine, Ph. D., president, American Educational Research Association	29
McDonald, Alice, deputy superintendent of public instruction, Kentucky Department of Education	37
Minter, Thomas, Ph. D., deputy chancellor of instruction, New York City Public Schools	25
Walker, James E., Ph. D., president, College Reading Association, and director of the reading/communications skills program, Northern Illinois University	9
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.:	
Anderson, Richard C., director, Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, prepared statement of	40
Bader, Lois, Ph. D., professor, College of Education, Michigan State University, prepared statement of	5
Emans, Robert, associate dean, School of Education at the College of William and Mary, prepared statement of	8
Greene, Maxine, Ph. D., president, American Educational Research Association:	
Prepared statement of	30
Testimony highlights	35
Goldberg, Milton, acting director, National Institute of Education, Prepared statement of	23
Macchiarola, Frank J., chancellor, New York City Public Schools, prepared statement of	27
McDonald, Alice, deputy superintendent of public instruction, Kentucky Department of Education, prepared statement of	38
Walker, James E., president, College Reading Association and director of the reading/communication skills program, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Ill., prepared statement of	12

APPENDIX

Anderson, Richard C., director, Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, letter to Chairman Murphy, dated June 16, 1981	52
Bader, Lois A., professor, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.:	
Letter to Chairman Murphy, dated June 22, 1981	46
Letter to Chairman Murphy, dated September 19, 1981, enclosing responses to questions	188
Cronin, Joseph M., president, Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corp., Boston, Mass., letter to Congressman Murphy, dated June 26, 1981, enclosing written testimony	67

Page

Davis, Nancy I., director of curriculum/instruction, Central Greene School District, Waynesburg, Pa., letter to Judy Wagner, Select Education Subcommittee, dated June 17, 1981 48
Ekwall, Eldon E., professor of education, the University of Texas at El Paso, letter to Chairman Murphy, dated June 18, 1981 49
Emans, Robert, associate dean, professor, and eminent scholar, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.:
Letter to Chairman Murphy, dated July 31, 1981, enclosing a list of references of studies 73
Letter to Chairman Murphy, dated July 1, 1981 46
Letter to Chairman Murphy, dated November 4, 1981, enclosing an additional letter 199
Letter to Dr. Milton Goldberg, acting director, National Institute of Education, dated August 20, 1981 89
Goldberg, Milton, acting director, National Institute of Education, Washington D.C., letter to Chairman Murphy, dated September 9, 1981, enclosing questions and responses 92
Staiger, Ralph, executive director, International Reading Association, Newark, Del:
Letter to Chairman Murphy, dated June 17, 1981 49
Letter to Chairman Murphy, dated June 24, 1981, enclosing written testimony 49
Walker, James E., president, College Reading Association, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Ill., letter to Chairman Murphy, dated August 12, 1981, enclosing responses to questions 82
Walsh, Dorothy, Council for Educational Development and Research, Washington, D.C., letter to Judy Wagner, House Subcommittee on Select Education, enclosing prepared testimony 55

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1981

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:40 a.m., in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Austin J. Murphy (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Murphy, Simon, and Erdahl.

Staff present: Roseann Tulley, administrative assistant; Judy Wagner, staff consultant; and Pat McMorrissey, minority legislative associate.

Mr. MURPHY. Good morning. I want to thank you all this morning for attending our oversight hearings concerning the National Institute of Education.

The passage of the Gramm-Latta resolution has forced the committee to pit essential programs against each other, and has unfortunately resulted in drastic cutbacks in all areas.

It has been very painful for many of the members of the Education and Labor Committee to propose reductions in programs which we know are working, which we know are providing essential services to people, and which we know are helping to improve the quality of life in the United States. It is only to comply with the mandate of this budget resolution that we have proposed these painful cuts and we have done so reluctantly.

This morning we will be hearing testimony on the current and future activities of the National Institute of Education. Under the reconciliation budget reported out of the Education and Labor Committee, NIE will have to severely curtail its research efforts. While NIE funds may be restored in the Conference Committee, the research supported by the Institute will still be significantly reduced.

We have some concerns regarding the way in which the Institute will have to distribute their funds as they are faced with such reductions. We have attempted to give the Institute flexibility to use their limited funds in the wisest manner possible. The committee bill removes all funding set-asides for existing educational labs and centers and requires all future grants and contracts to be made under competitive bidding.

We look to our witnesses today for recommendations on priorities for future education research and ways in which the NIE can best facilitate these efforts with its limited budget.

We welcome you and thank you for taking the time to advise us on this matter.

The first witness we have scheduled is Dr. Lois Bader, professor at the College of Education, Michigan State University.

First, I would like to call on my colleague, Mr. Erdahl, to see if he has any opening statement.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a brief opening statement.

Although the educational system is primarily the responsibility of the State and local governments, we all share concerns about the effectiveness of our Nation's schools. It is apparent that the Federal Government should provide leadership in conducting and supporting research which will make our schools more effective.

I believe that this can be accomplished through the National Institute of Education whose research activities on critical educational issues focus national education priorities.

As a bare minimum, NIE should be funded at a level which would be sufficient to meet its outstanding research commitments. Optimally, NIE should also receive modest funds to begin new projects, such as youth policy studies, research on school improvement and teacher effectiveness, and investigation into the educational implications of emerging technologies.

The House Committee on Education and Labor was required to cut their budget by about $12 billion. Most of the programs under the jurisdiction of this committee have been affected. Reduced Federal funding will be a reality throughout the educational community.

The NIE, like all other educational programs, will have to exercise fiscal restraint and be more accountable for its research, development and dissemination activities. In 1978, the Institute reorganized to improve their administrative structure. This process of change must continue to insure that the limited funds are used most effectively.

Issues have been raised which need to be addressed. Some people have expressed concern, for example, about the labs and centers receiving significant funds, representing a longstanding commitment of 40 percent of NIE's budget. We need to determine if duplication of research efforts exists, if research priorities are truly national priorities, and if the desired information is already available from other sources, or can be obtained in a more timely and less costly fashion.

Confronting these and other targeted concerns can greatly enhance NIE's contributions to the quality of education in America today and for the future.

Mr. Chairman, along with you, I am looking for some good testimony this morning.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Erdahl.

I neglected to point out that we have three witnesses all in the same panel, and I would like the other two witnesses to also come to the witness table, Dr. Robert Emans, and Dr. James Walker. We will proceed in that order.

We have your testimony, and all testimony, without objection, will be submitted in toto into the record. You may summarize your testimony or read it from the prepared text.

STATEMENT OF LOIS BADER, PH. D., PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Ms. BADER. Good morning.

My name is Lois Bader, and I am a professor at Michigan State University with responsibilities in teaching, research, and service in education.

My invitation to appear here states:

> In view of possible severe cuts in the NIE budget, the Subcommittee would appreciate your views on the research priorities that should be adopted by the Institute.

I want to emphasize that I do not support severe cuts in the NIE budget. I strongly support NIE and the need for funds for research in education. However, realizing that we are faced with scarce resources, I do have suggestions for avoiding waste and I have recommendations for research priorities.

The basic mission of NIE includes promoting educational equity and improving educational practice. Some NIE sponsored units, such as National Assessment of Educational Progress, have provided valuable information for the entire educational community. ERIC is an excellent resource. Other sponsored units appear, in my judgment, to be much less useful in helping NIE achieve its mission.

Last year, in hearings before this subcommittee, Shirley Chisholm expressed concerns about equity. Leonard Staviski mentioned doubts about NIE research efforts in regard to student achievement, and George Perry talked about questionable practices involving the use of funds. This year, I am saying that these are still problem areas.

I have a particular concern for the concentration of millions of dollars in a few labs, institutes and centers. This results in our not using the capabilities of individuals and groups in all parts of our Nation. If we are searching for creative ideas to improve education, we should not be drawing on a narrow base. A relatively small clique operating in an exclusive network is neither yielding nor likely to yield information commensurate with the millions invested.

Consider research findings such as these:

Students who are paying attention learn more than students who are not paying attention.

Students should have the prerequisite knowledge to learn a task.

Students should know why they are praised or criticized.

Teachers' expectations influence the ways they encourage students.

Numerous examples of these types of finding can be found in NIE sponsored reports. One does not need a degree in education to realize that for many years teachers have been given such common sense information as part of their preparation. Yet, we are purchasing this kind of information today at a high cost.

I agree with the suggestion made last year by Mr. Stavisky that we should not be handing out golden fleece awards here. I want to avoid embarrassing any individual researcher or project. Rather, we should be focusing on improving NIE's ability to accomplish its mission.

Here are some specific problems. With many studies, there is a serious question of the generalizability of findings. These are studies that are focused on four to six teachers and their students in schools in university communities. Rarely have these investigators ventured into any inner-city classroom, even more rarely have they stayed very long.

Too often researchers ignore vast amounts of information in existence on research in educational practices. Researchers frequently invent new terms, thus obscuring the fact that they are not investigating anything new or significant.

The creation of a few heavily funded projects has resulted in the employment of large numbers of educational researchers who have not taught for even a year in a public or private school. Thus, at great expense, they investigate areas new and possibly interesting to them and others like them, but of little value or new to those with experience in the field.

Some investigators have adequate credentials in areas such as statistical inference, but none in specializations such as reading. Yet, they proceed with inadequate scholarship and report what they have seen during brief forays into fields they know little about.

These researchers have almost no credibility outside of their immediate circle. Their reports are ignored, and when they appear at large national conferences on expense paid trips, their sessions are poorly attended. They hire each other as consultants and evaluators. They testify for each other. Some move back and forth between employment in NIE in Washington, and employment in NIE funded units. The network of personal relationships is such that one wonders if impartial reviews of proposals and projects are possible.

Because of this situation, I recommend funding more projects for smaller amounts, rather than a few projects for several million dollars. There are three reasons:

Since there is a need for replication or verification of studies such as those with small samples, it would be desirable to do this in projects that are independent of each other.

A broader base of researchers is likely to yield more creative ideas and avoid the problems of an exclusive network.

There is less opportunity for misusing funds in smaller projects.

I am optimistic about the possibility of improving those aspects of NIE's functioning that require attention. NIE has sponsored some excellent projects, and should continue to be supported.

I feel, with careful monitoring, many NIE projects should be continued, others should be redirected or terminated for they are not only wasting funds, they undermine NIE's credibility with experienced educators in state departments of education, school districts, and colleges.

There is much to be done in education. Based on my experience in schools in the United States and abroad in Department of Defense and international schools, I feel we have a great need to improve global education and intercultural studies. We do know how to teach reading and writing on both elementary and secondary levels, but we need to learn how to deal with the politics of education to deliver services.

We need to continue our efforts to provide equal access to learning. We are far from this goal. These are tremendous goals. We cannot afford to waste our resources, but we must channel our limited funds into the areas of greatest need.

Thank you for your attention.

[Prepared statement of Lois Bader follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LOIS BADER, PH. D., PROFESSOR, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

My name is Lois A. Bader. I am a professor at Michigan State University with responsibilities in teaching, research, and service in education. I have chaired the Professors of Reading, Special Interest Group, in the International Reading Association for the last two years and edited their journal. Currently, I chair the Research Commission of the College Reading Association. I am the author of books and articles on reading and reading research. I have been frequently invoived in research and instructional projects in schools and have worked directly with students, teachers, and state department of education personnel.

Your invitation to comment on the use of education funds during this time of scarce resources was accepted because I am concerned that funds need to continue to be available to support appropriate programs for low socio-economic groups, the handicapped, minorities, women, and the unemployed. In a larger context, I am also eager for this country to provide the best education possible for all people to improve the quality of their lives. These are goals that most of us share. The question is how can we reduce spending and continue to move forward?

The basic mission of the National Institute of Education includes promoting educational equity and improving educational practice. Some NIE sponsored units such as National Assessment of Educational Progress have provided valuable information for the entire educational community. Other sponsored units appear, in my judgment, to be much less useful in helping NIE achieve its mission.

I have a particular concern for the concentration of millions of dollars in a few labs, institutes, and centers. This results in our not using the capabilities of individuals and groups in all parts of our nation. We are excluding large numbers of exceptionally talented people from making contribution. If we are searching for creative ideas to improve education, we should not be drawing on a narrow base. A relatively small clique operating in an exclusive network is neither yielding, nor likely to yield, information commensurate with the millions invested.

Consider research findings such as these:

Students who are paying attention learn more than students who are not paying attention.

Students should have the prerequisite knowledge to learn a task.

Students should know why they are praised or criticized.

Teachers' expectations influence the ways they encourage students.

Numerous examples of these types of findings can be found in NIE sponsored reports. One does not need a degree in education to realize that for many years, teachers have been given such common sense information as part of their preparation. Yet, we are purchasing this kind of information today at a high cost.

With many studies there is a serious question of the generalizability of findings. These are studies that have focused on four to six teachers and their students in schools in university communities. Rarely have these investigators ventured into inner city classrooms. Even more rarely have they stayed very long.

Too often, the researchers ignore vast amounts of information in existence on research in educational practices. Major publications are not mentioned in scanty literature reviews.

Researchers frequently invent new terms, thus obscuring the fact that they are not investigating anything new or significant. But eventually when the findings are stripped of jargon, educational consumers do realize they have been given little of significance for their tax dollars.

The creation of a few heavily funded projects has resulted in the employment of large numbers of educational researchers who have not taught for even a year in public or private school. Thus, at great expenses they investigate areas new, and possibly interesting, to them and others like them, but of little value or news to those with experience in the field. Some investigators have adequate credentials in areas such as statistical inference, but have none in specializations such as reading. Yet, they proceed with their inadequate scholarship and report what they have seen during their brief forays into fields they know little about. These researchers have almost no credibility outside of their immediate circle. Their reports are ignored;

and when they appear at large national conferences on expense-paid trips, their sessions are poorly attended. They hire each other as consultants and evaluators. They testify for each other. Some move back and forth between employment in NIE in Washington and employment in NIE funded units. The network of personal relationships is such that one wonders if impartial reviews of proposals and projects are possible.

The suggestion has been made that there is a need for increasing the dissemination of information. However, there is no point in increasing funds to disseminate information that has little value. People in state departments of education, in colleges, and in schools do know what is being produced. There are existing inservice materials for systematically working with educational personnel which should be used rather than bypassing or ignoring them. The NIE supported ERIC system is an example of another, and fundamental, part of a total dissemination system.

Educators, like people in other professions, are not quick to point out mismanagement by those within their ranks for many reasons. Some are charitable, some are passive, some are intimidated, and some have been bought with trips abroad or appointments for members of their family. Allegations were made last year regarding mismanagement of one lab. I would suggest that there are other units that also need to be carefully monitored by agencies outside NIE.

I am very concerned about equity for minorities and women in NIE funded projects. When several women are hired who are married to other NIE supported people, there would seem to be a question as to the opportunities available for women who are on their own. This is not to say that there may not be people who are outstanding in the same field and happen to be married, but when this situation occurs again and again, it is suspect. Furthermore, I have not seen minorities in leadership positions in NIE funded projects. I have been told by some that they have been used as tokens and excluded from decision-making. This does appear to be the case. We have far to go here. There is a particular irony in one sex equity project in the employment of women who have been accused repeatedly of being racist by black graduate students.

I have made some harsh statements, but I have made them because I am optimistic about the possibility of improving those aspects of NIE's functioning that require attention. NIE has sponsored some excellent projects and should continue to be supported. I feel that with careful monitoring, many NIE projects should be continued. Others should be redirected or terminated, for they not only are wasting funds, they undermine NIE's credibility with experienced educators in state departments of education, school districts, and colleges.

There is much to be done in education. Based on my experience in the United States and abroad in Department of Defense and International Schools, I feel we have a great need to improve Global Education and Intercultural Studies. We do know how to teach reading and writing, but we need to learn how to deal with the politics of education to deliver services. We need to continue our efforts to provide equal access to learning. These are tremendous goals. We cannot afford to waste our resources, but must channel our limited funds into the areas of greatest need. Thank you for your attention.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Dr. Bader. If you will remain at the witness table, we will proceed with the other two panel members, and then we will get to questions.

Dr. Emans.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT EMANS, PH. D., PROFESSOR, ASSOCIATE DEAN, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

Mr. EMANS. My name is Robert Emans. I am associate dean, professor, and eminent scholar in the School of Education at the College of William and Mary in Virginia.

I have provided you with my written testimony, and I will not read it. I will paraphrase and expand on certain portions.

To me the basic question that I think confronts NIE at this time is who is the direct user of educational research. I think to put that question perhaps another way, who is NIE's primary client? I have read last year's testimony. I have gathered together and read much literature provided me by NIE, and I have found many clients

listed within that literature, and these clients are consumers of what NIE is producing. They include Congress, Federal policymakers, State and local policymakers, superintendents, principals, school district personnel, professional organizations, parents, citizens, publishers, public school students, college students, teachers, researchers, and paraprofessionals. These are all very important people, but I believe, in my opinion, that these people that I have just listed are not the primary users of research.

I have quoted in my written testimony a statement by B. Othanel Smith, and I would like to read that again:

> It is a fundamental error to assume that practitioners—administrators, teachers, supervisors, and so on—are the avenue through which the findings and conclusions of research are to enter directly into practice. Pedagogical faculties who educate teachers and train them for professional service are responsible for evaluating and interpreting research.

This statement, in my judgment, runs in direct contrast to a statement that was made before this committee by the then Acting Director of NIE, and I quote from last year's testimony.

> We have expanded our review process to involve the actual user of educational research, the practitioner in the field.

Again let me emphasize that I do not believe, along with Dr. Smith, that the actual user, the direct user of educational research is the practitioner in the field, instead it is essentially the professor, and more specifically, the professor of teaching methods. In the testimony that I read, and in the literature that I have read from NIE, I see that this person, this individual, the professor of teaching methods, is hardly ever even mentioned.

What are the consequences of NIE's failure to properly identify the major user of educational research, or to put it another way, the major client of NIE? I believe that there are a number.

First, I think it is reflected, or influences the makeup of the staff of many of the centers, and perhaps elsewhere. I did a very brief analysis of the staff members and consultants at one center. There were 16 people whose backgrounds I analyzed, and only 10 were what I would call primary users of educational research. Even among those 10, they were producers of educational research, but they were not the professor or teacher of teaching methods.

Second, I think that NIE, therefore, is becoming more and more involved in direct dissemination of its findings. Of course, dissemination is important, and it is a crucial problem that confronts the educational researcher. But I am afraid that NIE may become a national teachers college of education, and I think that that is something that NIE must avoid.

Third, and Dr. Bader has said very well, I believe, the quality and nature of research that NIE conducts is affected. I did a brief study of what I consider to be some of the classics in educational research, and I tried to be influenced by opinion about whether or not the studies had received some type of national recognition.

I found several cases in which these studies, which I believe are central studies, not only were not even included in the bibliographies of much of the literature of NIE, at least what I saw, but the studies that I am referring to had used essentially the same procedures and came out with essentially the same results as research that had most recently been conducted and published by NIE.

Finally, I think another consequence, and I think a serious one, is that research findings are not getting into the hands of the people who can use them most effectively for improving the classroom practices.

In my written testimony, I indicated that there were four proposals that I thought NIE should focus on. One is to recognize who their primary client is, and that I believe is the professor of teaching methods.

Second, I think that NIE must involve the professors of methods courses in the research that NIE is conducting, and there just is not very much of that going on today.

Third, I think the NIE should upgrade the quality of professors of teaching methods, to conduct research in those areas so that these people will be able to be better interpretors of the research that NIE produces.

Finally, NIE should build a closer liaison with the professors of methods courses and themselves.

In closing, I would like to emphasize that the work that NIE is doing is vital. NIE is effective, and it would be a tragedy if its effectiveness were diminished because of vast budget cuts. However, NIE would become even more effective, in my opinion, if action were taken on the four proposals that I have outlined.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Robert Emans follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT EMANS, ASSOCIATE DEAN, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AT THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

My name is Robert Emans. I am Associate Dean, Professor, and Eminent Scholar in the School of Education of the College of William and Mary in Virginia. Also, I am a former head of elementary education at The Ohio State University and a former Dean of the College of Education at the University of Maryland. I appreciate having an opportunity to speak before you because, like many in this room, I am deeply concerned about the quality of education provided in our schools.

I asked Dr. Bader to allow my presentation to follow hers as I hope that my comments will compliment what she says.

Like Dr. Bader, it would distress me if the funding for NIE were cut as drastically as has been proposed. As I suspect other witnesses are testifying this morning, research in education has never been supported to the extent to which it should be when its potential for the improvement of schooling is considered. To cut back further on the small fraction of a percentage of this nation's wealth that is currently devoted to educational research would be irresponsible and detrimental to the well-being of future generations of Americans.

Dr. Bader has eloquently stated that research in education too often only verifies the obvious and equally often fails to add to existing knowledge. The sad state of affairs is that the findings of even systematic research are seldom translated into classroom practices. NIE has attempted and seems to be about to try different solutions to this problem; some of limited application and others both costly and inefficient. For example, I have heard it proposed that NIE should hold workshops for public school personnel. I assert that to do this effectively would require that all the funds currently allocated to educational research be spent on dissemination. It has also been proposed that NIE should influence the publishers of educational materials to organize their texts to reflect the findings of research. However, only a small part of the benefits that can accrue from educational research can be packaged in written texts and even then few teachers use instructional materials as the authors intend unless they are prepared to do so by extensive pretraining and supervision. An abuse could result should NIE become an arm of, or the servant of, the publishing industry. In recent years NIE has made laudable efforts to develop liaison with the public schools through the chief executive officers of the states and cities. However, none of the above groups are, or should be, the pivotal group for review and dissemination of much of the educational research that is conducted by NIE. The direct consumer of educational research is not the practitioner, including

classroom teachers. As Dr. B. Othanel Smith has stated in A Design for a School of Pedagogy, a report recently prepared for the U.S. Department of Education:

> It is a fundamental error to assume that practitioners—administrators, teachers, supervisors, and so on—are the avenue through which the findings and conclusions of research are to enter directly into practice. . . . [P]edagogical faculties who educate teachers and train them for professional service are responsible for evaluating and interpreting research. . . . (p. 53-54)

Thus, it is usually college professors who introduce and interpret research findings to prepare school personnel to implement them; but school practices are not directly influenced by professors of psychology and linguistics or even professors of educational psychology. Instead it is the professors who teach methods courses that are able to promote the application of much of the research that NIE and other educational researchers produce.

Their importance for improving schooling must be recognized and I make the following proposals:

1. It must be recognized that it is professors who are responsible for teaching methods courses that are the primary consumers of the findings of educational research and, thus, the clients of NIE.
2. Professors responsible for methods courses should be included among those conducting research. NIE has, by and large and probably unwittingly, ignored this group. If the purpose is to have educators use research findings then it is the professors of methods courses who should be included in the identification, development and execution of research projects. Professors of teaching methods are in a position to test the applications of both old and new research findings for the present-day classroom, and to provide for an orderly framework for the identification of new areas for research.
3. NIE should conduct research on how to assist professors of methods courses in the interpretation and use of research findings.
4. Just as NIE has done with the public school personnel and other groups, it should take steps to build liaison between itself and its pivotal clients—the professors of teaching methods.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Emans.

Dr. Walker.

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. WALKER, PH. D., PRESIDENT, COLLEGE READING ASSOCIATION, AND DIRECTOR OF THE READING/COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS PROGRAM, NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Mr. WALKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am James E. Walker, president of the College Reading Association, and director of the reading/communications skills program at Northern Illinois University in DeKalb. You have a copy of my prepared statement, so I will simply try to summarize it at this time.

For the past 19 years, I have taught at all levels of education, elementary through adult, in inner city, suburban, and rural communities. Formerly, I directed the University of Kentucky Teacher Corps component, the largest Teacher Corps component in the country at that time.

In the period of the last 19 years that I have been involved in education, we have seen some obvious examples of research which directly impacts or should impact professors in the classroom. For example, the first grade studies in reading told us what perhaps we already knew, but they simply verified what had not been substantiated before, and that is that the most important variable in the classroom is the teacher as far as helping a child learn to read.

In the late sixties, we had the NDEA summer training institutes for teachers, which were intended to directly impact what the teacher was going to do in the classroom as a result of these research studies. But we saw an example, once again, where funds

were drastically cut, and in this case they were discontinued outright.

Another example of research that has been conducted which seems to show us some very positive results recently were the studies of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. We have seen gains, especially in the early grades, and there seems to be some extremely heartening news about what is happening with the disadvantaged children, especially those taught under title I programs. Unfortunately, once again, we are going to have to suffer drastic cuts in this area.

Therefore, in the hope of avoiding some further disappointments such as these, I should like to bring up or refer to research which has been conducted in the recent past under the general auspices of NIE.

Basically, there are two complaints that seem to come forward from the educational community across the Nation: first, the audience of the research; second, the question of credibility.

As far as the audience is concerned, the audience seems to be other researchers, and this seems to be verified by the fact that the jargon used in very many cases is incomprehensible, as I indicated in my statement. We have a problem, again, of the claim of esoteric research intended only for a few. My question then simply is, can we afford to continue to sponsor this kind of research?

I shudder when I think of colleagues across the country who tell me that by their own estimates it will take 20 to 25 years to implement in the classroom some of the research that we are reading today.

Classroom-based teachers and educators also raise the question of credibility, when the research is done by people who have never taught or functioned at the level where the research is concentrated.

While these, obviously, are negative factors, we still have examples of some outstanding efforts that promote good research. My statement lists three.

Dolores Durkin at the University of Illinois has for many years produced research which is readable, understandable, and practical.

I refer to Robert Ruddell at Berkeley, whose research on the teacher as an agent of change has again helped us most immediately to make good educational decisions.

Third, Harold Herber at Syracuse University, since in the early seventies, has influenced the educational community at the secondary level. Essentially every textbook appearing on the market today in reading education refers directly to the research of Professor Herber.

I am especially heartened by the progress we have seen over the course of the years with the information coming from the National Assessment of Educational Progress. We now have a strong longitudinal data base which has come about with the sound direction and management of Roy Forbes, whom I knew when I was associated with the Teacher Corps program in Louisville.

The ERIC system is another extensive data base which is part of the fabric of the research that goes on every day. For many re-

searchers, it is the place where they turn initially to determine the question of what has been done up to the present.

My colleague, Ann Faulkner, the president of the Western College Reading Association, asked me to specifically point to the fact that our efforts will be seriously hampered if the ERIC system is not given its rightful high priority.

According to your invitation, you asked me to suggest priorities. I am particularly interested in your intention that the funds for educational research be more diverse and equitably distributed. I am convinced that this will be more favorably received by the broad-based national educational community. I am referring specifically to unsolicited proposal awards to more researchers, not fewer.

Given the situation of cuts in funds, we should still hope that ways could be found to divert funds to more institutions. According to the testimony to this committee in February 1980, I hope that women and minorities are part of this goal to encourage additional research efforts.

The research and dissemination centers affect different pockets which are not necessarily in the broad educational community. They, perhaps, serve a more limited function. My statement indicates an example of Research Within Reach, a publication from CEMREL, which is a response to concerns of teachers on 22 key questions. In very readable language, this resource provides a basis for discussion, for study, and for further clarification. We do have examples of research which can be understood and enjoyed at the same time.

Nevertheless, we continue to have the overwhelming problem of dissemination in our educational research. Roger Farr's testimony 2 years ago compared reading achievement in this country, and talked of the gains over the past 30 years. We have much higher levels of literacy, but certainly, according to the daily press, we do not get this type of information.

Another example, the adult performance level study. I recall the headlines screaming, "Twenty Percent of Americans Are Illiterate." But what I did not read in the article was the fact that the standards continue to rise and definitions continue to change.

Today, as societal demands dictate, the ability to perform functional tasks in reading, writing, and computation suggests a standard for literacy. but these kinds of clarifications have never been made. Therefore, we need more accurate dissemination from more NIE programs.

My priorities, I think, are already clear. I would like to close, Mr. Chairman, with this statement.

We have a duty to continue to conduct research or we will face what could be some kind of intellectual suicide. It is imperative that we continue to research, that we continue to raise the questions, and that we continue to demand the answers. That the answers are possible should be clear from some of the direct applications of research studies in our classrooms and from the achievements I have referred to in my testimony.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will continue in these efforts under the direction of the National Institute of Education.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify today. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of James E. Walker follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JAMES E. WALKER, PRESIDENT, COLLEGE READING ASSOCIATION AND DIRECTOR OF THE READING/COMMUNICATION SKILLS PROGRAM, NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, DEKALB, ILL.

Mr. Chairman, I am James E. Walker. I appreciate your invitation to testify in Washington today, for it also gives me an opportunity to return to the city where I lived and studied from 1960 to 1962.

For the past 19 years, I have worked as a Title I elementary reading teacher in inner-city Newark, New Jersey and as an elementary reading specialist in Louisville, Kentucky. I have taught in cities and suburbs at the junior high, senior high, college, and adult levels. Having completed two advanced degrees in reading education, I later was appointed as director of the University of Kentucky Teacher Corps Program in the Louisville Consortium, the largest Teacher Corps Program in the country at that time.

For the past seven years as a member of the Reading Faculty at Northern Illinois University, I have served as director of the Reading/Communication Skills Program. For the past semester I have been on sabbatical leave, visiting and observing in thirty institutions: universities, state offices of education, large city school districts, and dissemination centers in the Southwest, to gain some insights on the problems and needs related to reading and the bilingual learner.

Considering the purpose of today's hearing, I would like to comment on various facets of the National Institute of Education and how they affect the professional lives of thousands of professors, teachers and, through them, pupils. One certainly has to realize that the problems that the Institute has had over the past several years with the turnover in Directors and Acting-Directors, has not afforded the Institute a fair opportunity to stabilize. Problems of monitoring programs across the country have been recognized and are being dealt with now. What happens in the National Institute of Education can have an effect on the continuation of literacy instruction in this country.

To set the stage for some later comments, I should like to point out to the Committee that in the late 60s, research was reported which underscored once again the importance of the teacher in the classroom. A series of the 27 funded projects known as the First-Grade Reading Studies resulted in the conclusion that the most important variable in a child's learning to read was the classroom teacher. Considering the time and effort that went into those research studies (some were extended for two and three years), not very much happened as a consequence. We did not turn our attention to developing better classroom teachers of reading as a result of those research studies. On the contrary, the NDEA Summer Teacher Training Institutes, intended to apply research results in the most immediate and transferable way, were discontinued.

Some of the research that has come forth recently from the National Assessment of Educational Progress pinpoints precisely where we have made some educational gains in this country in the period 1971-1980. Particularly when we have seen reading improvement in the early grades, we now learn that Title I programs which contribute to this achievement are also being cut. In the hope of avoiding further disappointments following upon the dissemination of information such as the First Grade and NAEP studies, I should like to focus now on some recent developments in research sponsored by NIE.

In too many instances, two complaints are repeated. The first concerns the audience of some of the research; the second concerns the credibility of the researchers.

One of the missions of NIE is to improve educational practice. The question arises: Now or later—or both? You have asked me to suggest a priority and I will attempt to do so.

There is a good deal of research that seems to have as its audience other researchers. This may be quite appropriate but in my own discipline, if I find the technical reports replete with a jargon that I find incomprehensible after 19 years in the profession, I have little use for those reports. If the writing is so esoteric as to render the product useful to only a limited number of colleagues, I question whether we can afford to continue on this course, given the situation of our economy. My recent question to many other professors and graduate students was: How long before we can reasonably expect to see the results of this research affecting classroom teaching practices? The consensus is between twenty and twenty-five years. If this is so, then both a conclusion and a priority are obvious.

The second concern, the credibility factor, does not question one's ability to conduct research. It says much, however, about the ability to impact the practicing educational community when one has never taught or worked at the level where

the research is concentrated. As the child asked, "Are you a book-doctor or a people-doctor?" Again, this simply confronts the researcher with questions of credibility. For this reason, another priority becomes obvious. It is the same subtlety that exists when one who has never married attempts to tell parents how to raise their children. Parents tend to reject advice given in this context, except in very rare cases. The same situation applies too with researchers and practitioners. Fortunately, we do have research that directly touches on classroom practices. Very briefly, I refer to three examples. The work of Dolores Durkin at the University of Illinois, a specialist in reading in the primary grades, is an example of a researcher who can talk to classroom teachers. College professors, doctoral students, and teachers find Professor Durkin's work readable, understandable, and practical because it helps them to make decisions on what happens in a classroom. On the West Coast, Robert Ruddell at Berkeley has focused for several years on the teacher as an agent of change. He provides research information that can help others make educational decisions. A third illustration is the work of Harold Herber at Syracuse University. He has worked extensively to improve the reading of secondary level students in their different subject areas. The influence of his efforts can be seen in the professional reading textbooks appearing on the market today. These examples give witness to the fact that research done in classrooms is the kind of research that is most immediately translatable.

The National Institute of Education has been responsible for helping to disseminate some of this information. The dissemination, however, has to be strong and pointed. For example, the National Assessment of Educational Progress provides the kind of information that most directly reaches education policymakers and curriculum planners. Given the extensive data base that has been accumulated since 1971, we have the benefits of respected longitudinal studies that are derived from classrooms across the country. The soundness of direction and management brought to the NAEP office since 1974 by Roy Forbes, whom I knew in Louisville, is what we need in all NIE efforts.

The Education Resource Information Center (ERIC) is another example of an extensive data base. ERIC has become such a part of the fabric of ongoing research that we perhaps take it for granted. In virtually every research effort initiated today, the first source of contact with what has already been learned is through the ERIC system. Writers, researchers, teachers, and students would find their efforts seriously hampered should ERIC not be given its rightful, high priority. The "Information Explosion" is another way of trying to explain why ERIC is a necessary, practical tool for educators.

Another priority is in who receives research funds. A more diverse and equitable distribution of funds for research sponsored by NIE would be favorably received by a broad-based national educational community. This refers specifically to unsolicited proposal awards made available to more, not fewer, researchers. Even with the inevitability of cutbacks in funding, a comprehensive distribution of perhaps somewhat modest expenditures will still allow researchers in many institutions to begin or to continue research. Past testimony to this Committee in February, 1980, clarifies the role of women and minorities as part of this goal to assist more researchers than has been true in the past.

The Research and Dissemination Centers are another function of NIE. The Centers affect different pockets of people and not necessarily the larger segment of the educational community. The most functional purpose of the Centers, as researchers and research consumers know, lies in their ability to synthesize the massive body of information on specified topics. An example of such a synthesis is the monograph Research Within Reach (CEMREL), a response to concerns of reading educators on 22 key questions that researchers have addressed. In readable language, the book provides a basis for discussion, study, and further clarification in a way that assures the reader that the products of research can be understood and enjoyed at the same time.

In testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities, Roger Farr, past president of the International Reading Association, pointed out the problems in assessing literacy achievement in the United States. He emphasized that we have a major problem in disseminating information. As a reading educator, researcher, and test developer, Farr analyzed the reading achievement of students over a span of thirty years. He concluded that we achieved much higher levels of literacy in this country than we realized. The problem, again, is one of disseminating information not only to the educational community, but to the American public as well.

Another example that illustrates the need to disseminate accurately and to communicate intelligently is that of the research of the Adult Performance Level Study at the University of Texas at Austin. The headline writers could hardly contain

themselves: twenty percent of Americans are illiterate! What was never explained or even suggested, as Roger Farr pointed out, was that standards of literacy in this country, in fact throughout the world, are continually rising. Completion of the fifth and then the eighth grade were the standards for literacy many years ago. At another time, reading grade levels were the standard. Today, as societal demands dictate, the ability to perform functional tasks in reading, writing, and computation suggests a standard for literacy. Somehow these clarifications are not easily made. For this reason, I suspect that in the year 2000 and again in 2025, twenty percent of the country will still be considered illiterate.

I have tried to suggest some glaring examples of why we need more accurate dissemination. The kind of leadership that has been evident in the NAEP should also be evident in the R and D network.

We have a duty to continue to conduct research or we will face the alternative of what could be a form of intellectual suicide. It is imperative that we continue to research, that we continue to raise the questions, and that we continue to demand the answers. That the answers are possible should be clear from some of the direct applications of research studies in our classrooms and from the achievements referred to earlier. It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will continue in these efforts under the direction of the National Institute of Education. I appreciate the opportunity to testify today. Thank you.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Dr. Walker.

We have also been joined by our colleague from Illinois, Paul Simon. I will ask if Mr. Simon has any questions first.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having the hearings so that we can focus on some of the problems that may exist here.

I apologize to Lois Bader for not being here when she testified. I am just reading through your testimony now.

As I sense it, and I would like to address this to all three, what you are suggesting is an improvement in methods and procedure and focus, rather than eliminating NIE or cutting back drastically, or anything like that.

Am I correct, or am I incorrect, if I can address this to all three of you.

Ms. BADER. That is right, I think we would agree on that.

Mr. EMANS. Definitely.

Mr. SIMON. Dr. Walker, if I may just take off on a couple of points. First of all, it is good to have someone from Illinois here as a witness.

This is really not an NIE issue, but you mention the summer teacher training institutes under NDEA. These were some of the finest efforts that have happened under Federal sponsorship.

I see a couple of people back there from the Department of Education representing the Secretary.

If we could go back and include some of these programs, I think that it would be one of the greatest things that we could do for education in the country. In the area of foreign languages, for example, we improved the quality of instruction immeasurably through those programs.

I also like what you said about the jargon and I join you, with all due respect to my friends at NIE and it is not just NIE. The incomprehensible jargon in every area is one of the weaknesses, if I may be candid as a nonacademician, of the academic community.

Alan Nevins, one of the greatest historians this Nation ever produced—in a great article in the American Political Science Association Quarterly—said that the academic community was ruining history. I always remember reading Dean Acheson saying,

he had picked up the story about what was happening in Korea, and why. He was personally involved, but he said he couldn't understand the story. I remember picking up an article one time, and it said something like, "How to Win an Election," and it ended up $X2 - y = R$, and who was I to disagree with such a conclusion?

Having said all this about jargon being incomprehensible, then you assure me that we have a "strong longitudinal data base." [Laughter.]

I have to say that I don't know what you mean by a strong longitudinal data base.

Mr. WALKER. That is a lot of information that has been accumulated over many years.

Mr. SIMON. Dr. Emans, let me touch on one of the things that you don't touch on here, and I don't know that NIE has done any research on it. You touch on the quality problem, and I just taped a television program this morning with Secretary Bell where this matter came up.

I am concerned, as you look at the universities today, our brighter students are going into engineering, law, journalism, and medicine. Unfortunately, the tests indicate that teaching is appealing to much too great an extent to those with only mediocre talent.

Secretary Bell mentioned that he had spoken to a group of 140 Presidential scholars, and he said: "How many of you intend to be teachers?" Three raised their hands.

This is getting afield, and if you want to rule me out of order, you may, Mr. Chairman, but I think that it is important to everything that we are concerned about.

Mr. EMANS. I think you are absolutely right in your observation. This is a concern that all of us in teacher education are vitally concerned with. We view teaching as being one of the greatest challenges that anybody could have. We need to have the brightest and the best.

We can give all kinds of reasons, probably some valid and some not. At one time women went into teaching because they could not go into other areas. Now the bright women do go into other areas, where previously they would have gone into teaching, therefore, as a consequence, those scores keep going lower and lower.

I think we need to do everything we can to get the brightest and the best into teaching. I think that it is a perfectly legitimate area for NIE to be working on. I think one of the ways in which you get the brightest and the best, is to make it an intellectually challenging activity, and not just the subject matter that that teacher is teaching, but to know something about how people learn and how people react in groups and what-have-you.

These are exciting things for people to learn. We need to emphasize that. I think we will, as a result, be able to get the brighter people into teaching.

By the way, there are bright people who are teaching. I don't want to say that everybody who goes into teaching is not bright, there are a lot of bright people. But it is an intellectually challenging activity, and we need to make that known to people. That is one of the best things that we can do in order to get people who are bright and the best into teaching.

Mr. SIMON. But the present statistics would indicate that there may be a shift in who is going into teaching, and a shift that is not a good omen for the future of the Nation.

Mr. EMANS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to all three members of the panel for sharing their views with us.

I would also share the concern that my colleague from Illinois, Mr. Simon, has expressed to us now. I think what he is saying in another way is to make the research available, understandable, and applicable, and sometimes the jargon gets in the way. Politicians, lawyers, and others have jargons that sometimes get in the way of expressing what they really mean to say.

I guess a question for all of us, as we look at the limited funding that is going to be approved by this Congress for NIE, how should it be properly used?

I am asking a very broad question, and I guess because all three of you tend to be a bit critical of the present or past practices, the fundamental question is, who should determine the priorities and recipients of research funds, now should this be carried out?

Are we in the Congress going to say, "Well, this is a program," and get to that definition? I don't think so. I think that we are going to be allocating funds to an entity, such as NIE, and there has to be a responsible, not only dissemination of knowledge and information, but of funds and a selection of priorities where research is most meaningful.

Ms. BADER. If I understand your question, it is who is to determine the priorities. I would say that we need to involve diverse groups. The State departments of education, for example, are looking to NIE for information that will help them.

I spoke with two people, who are employed in the Michigan State Department of Education, who said that they had conducted an in-house review of research findings that were coming from various parts of the country, and found little that they were able to use. But they said that they have information needs that they need to have fulfilled. So I would suggest that people from the State departments of education should be very much involved.

Certainly the people from cities who have tremendous problems in educating low-economic groups, need to have their concerns heard and met. I would say the group that we represent, who work with teachers in classrooms and prepare teachers and specialists, need to be involved.

Another point I would like to make, I think we need very much involved in this process people who are capable in research and in delivery of services. There are those who believe or act as if they believe that some people are researchers and others are practitioners. They claim we are on two levels also.

I submit, as Dr. Walker has indicated, that there are people around the country who are very capable in basic research, and in field research, who also have a great deal of experience in delivering good services. I would like to see such people very much involved.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you very much.

Dr. Emans, or Dr. Walker, would you care to respond in that same general area, I admit that it is a broad one.

Mr. WALKER. It seems that what we are trying to emphasize this morning to this panel, what we are trying to indicate, is our frustration over the problems in the past, and some of them are really not the fault of NIE.

Nevertheless, when research awards are given, we would hope that they would take very strongly our serious concern that the funds be more equitably distributed, and that they put these funds into research in a way that will more directly and immediately have an influence on what is happening in our classrooms.

I don't think that we can wait enormously long periods of time before some aspects of basic research filter down to the classroom. In some ways I suppose that that is part of the American spirit, we want the information quickly. There have been some cases in the past where we have rushed into things much too fast, but I would hope that my professional colleagues in the National Institute of Education would be able to make those decisions based on some of the testimony that they will hear today.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you.

Mr. EMANS. I would just like to repeat to some extent what I said before, emphasizing what Dr. B. Othanel Smith said.

> Pedagogical faculties who educate teachers and train them for professional service are responsible for evaluating and interpreting research.

I think it is also those people who need to have a bigger say with respect to which research is to be studied, how it is to be studied, how the results of that reseach should have an impact on practice. I think it is this group, in my interpretation of what we are saying, that has not been consulted enough with respect to the funding of research projects.

Mr. ERDAHL. Another observation, and perhaps this is more of a question of semantics, and I am not trying to be contentious.

Dr. Emans, you made a comment that they are the primary users, and perhaps these are professors, teaching professors of other teachers and administrators. I think the thing that we need to remember on both sides of the table, the ultimate recipients are the students. I am sure that this is what we have in mind, but sometimes all of us, congressmen, researchers, we can get so involved in the process that sometimes we tend to overlook who are the recipients of the process.

Mr. EMANS. The ultimate client, of course, is the learner. But the person who takes the research, and interprets it, is essentially the college professor, and that is my point.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURPHY. I have one general question for the panel.

All three of you, of course, have expressed great concern about the way NIE is currently funding research, but all of you do support the concept of NIE. This committee has recommended removing the set aside for existing labs and centers that presently receive about 40 percent of the NIE money.

Will the elimination of the set aside, in your opinion, solve some of the problems that you see?

Ms. BADER. Yes. I would think that that would help because, then, the centers, labs, and institutes would become more responsive.

Mr. MURPHY. When they become competitive.

Ms. BADER. Also, with the elimination of the earmarked funds, not only would NIE become more responsive to the needs of the groups that I indicated, but also I think that we would have more funds available for other people who may have a great deal to contribute.

Mr. MURPHY. Dr. Emans.

Mr. EMANS. I am not knowledgeable in this. I think one thing I do learn sometimes, when I don't know something, I should keep quiet. I am going to do that at this point.

Mr. MURPHY. Dr. Walker.

Mr. WALKER. I am sorry to hear about the level of cuts directed toward the centers themselves. In a recent sabbatical, I had a first-hand example of the assistance that they can provide to an individual who has questions. The clearinghouses and dissemination centers, when I have contacted them, have always been extremely helpful to me.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that this is about all I can comment, and express my disappointment at this time.

In my testimony, I did refer to perhaps to what might be more sharply focused dissemination. Maybe the cutbacks, as you call them, might cause us to bring that about.

Mr. MURPHY. Dr. Emans, you were talking about primary users. You have a delineation between the practitioner and the professor, or instructor. Is that where you delineate?

Mr. EMANS. Yes. I think the practitioner is, in my opinion, the classroom teacher, the principal and the superintendent. I think your primary interpretor of educational research is your college professor.

Mr. MURPHY. You think that they are the ones who are actually the receiver of the research, or that they should be the receiver.

Mr. EMANS. They should be the receiver of the research findings, yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Dr. Bader, you alluded to some problems that you have seen. Could you be a little more specific about your illustrations of abuse in NIE funding, if you can, so that we may explore those possibilities?

Ms. BADER. As I say, I am not here to give out Golden Fleece awards, or hurt a particular individual, but I can think of one example.

I attended an NIE supported conference on beginning reading. This conference was held at a place that has some excellent programs. During the course of the presentation of papers, supposedly on beginning reading instruction, someone presented a fine piece of basic research.

Shirley Jackson, who was there from Right to Read in Washington asked the presenter, "Pardon me, but what does this have to do with beginning reading instruction?" The presenter said, "I haven't the slightest idea." She said, "But in your paper, you give implications for beginning reading." He said, "Well, this was a condition of my attending this conference."

All this, incidentally, was taken down by a stenographer.

Then around the table some very frank conversation ensued with pressing from Shirley Jackson. Participants said, "Look, many of us are here because we went to school together, we know each other, we know people in NIE. It is true, we have not been in the classroom and we don't know anything about reading instruction." Then the discussion continued. I have found this situation to be fairly typical.

Mr. MURPHY. You also made reference to people who are with NIE and then become involved in recipient programs, and travel the route up and down.

Ms. BADER. Yes, I have seen those cases. Again, there are cases as I have cited, of people moving from NIE to positions in a university that are NIE funded. Some persons have been employed at NIE when their universities were given large grants. There are examples of hiring quite a few relatives in projects. I would say, in cases like that, I would not want a hard and fast rule. I think there is probably a good reason for hiring one or two of these people. I am trying to make the point here that when you see this is repeated again, again, and again, then you have a problem.

I said I was worried about opportunities for women trying to be accepted on their own merits. I have no objection to having a husband and wife team, because I think in doing your work, you sometimes meet someone and marry someone who has a great deal of expertise in your field. I would not criticize anyone for hiring that couple. I am saying that if you see a repeated situation, then someone must look into it.

What I was trying to suggest in my statement is that NIE should do a much more careful job of monitoring than they have. I hope in the future they will be very careful to look at these things. I think it would be helpful if they talked not only with people within a project, because obviously those persons are going to be inclined to say something positive, as Mr. Stavisky said last year. I think they ought to talk with a number of people.

Mr. MURPHY. We will get into that with the director when we question him.

I thank the panel very much.

Mr. SIMON. If I could just follow through.

First of all, incidentally, since I asked my questions, I have had a chance to read your statement. I applaud particularly your sentence here, "I feel we have a great need to improve global education and intercultural studies."

If I may ask all three of you, have you ever made application for an NIE grant? If so, did you feel that you got a fair shake as far as consideration for that? If you got the grant, was there adequate follow through to make sure you really did what you got the grant for?

Ms. BADER. I was involved in an application for a very large grant, but I was never brought into the center of that situation, so I cannot really say what was happening with the follow-up.

Mr. SIMON. The grant was awarded, was it, or was it not awarded?

Ms. BADER. Yes, it was awarded.

Mr. SIMON. Did you feel that there was adequate follow through, or is it difficult for you to make that judgment?

Ms. BADER. No one ever spoke with me from NIE, even though I was identified in the proposal as a principal investigator, so I don't know what they were doing for followthrough.

Mr. SIMON. If I may ask the same of the other two.

Mr. EMANS. I have applied for various grants, and I have been successful in some and not successful in others. Part of my responsibility is to work with the faculty and to help them file for grants.

I would say that when somebody's grant has been approved, they think that the process has been very fair. When the grant is not approved, they think that it is very unfair.

Mr. SIMON. It is a reasonable conclusion.

Mr. EMANS. I think that it is something that should be looked into. As far as the follow through, I think it depends on who they are following up on.

Mr. WALKER. My only experience had to do with the teacher corps program. I have not applied for an NIE grant.

Mr. SIMON. One final comment, Mr. Chairman.

When Dr. Bader was talking about people going from NIE to places where they were receiving grants, contracts, and so forth, I thought we were talking about the Department of Defense for a moment, rather than NIE. [General laughter.]

Mr. MURPHY. We thank the panel very much. If you have any additional testimony or evidence, we would appreciate it if you would send it to the subcommittee office. Thank you very much.

The next panel is Dr. Milton Goldberg, Acting Director, National Institute of Education; Dr. Thomas Minter, deputy chancellor for instruction for New York City Public Schools; and Dr. Maxine Green, president of the American Educational Research Association. Will you please come to the witness table.

I notice that a couple of you have rather lengthy testimony. We would greatly appreciate it if you would summarize because the House is in session this morning. At any time the bells may ring and members will leave. So we would appreciate it if you could summarize, particularly the 8- and 10-page testimonies that you have.

Dr. Goldberg.

STATEMENT OF MILTON GOLDBERG, PH. D., ACTING DIRECTOR, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you this morning and discuss the implications of the recommendations of this committee with respect to NIE funding in fiscal year 1982.

I thought, given the testimony we have just heard, that it might be appropriate for me to tell you briefly about my own background.

I come to this position with many years in public education as a classroom teacher, as a school principal, as a professor of education. As a matter of fact, I was a colleague of Dr. Emans at Temple University. I have experienced a variety of professions that, I think, are necessary to do good educational research, as the panel that preceded me indicated.

I would like to talk briefly about NIE and the implications of the recommended cuts in the Institute, Mr. Murphy, and I will try to keep it very brief and shorten my statement.

As you know, the Institute is currently operating under a budget of $65.6 million this year. The President has requested $61 million. The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources has recommended $59 million for NIE, and this committee has recommended a drastic reduction to a level of $25 million. I must say that this amount will severely impair our ability to meet our congressional mandate and to continue serving education thoughout this country.

I need not tell this group about education and its importance to this country. It is a paramount investment in not only the present, but the future of this country. We spend over $200 billion in education.

We have created at NIE an Institute which pursues several goals. We have become a focal point for examining important national problems in education. We provide knowledge about education to teachers, administrators, policymakers, and parents. We provide leadership in improving education, and we anticipate new problems in order to address them when they arise.

Let me take a minute to tell you about the NIE staff, since the issue of who does the work has come up this morning.

Two-thirds of our professional staff possess the earned doctorate in fields like education, psychology, linguistics, reading, mathematics, and law. Half of our professional staff have been classroom teachers in elementary schools, in secondary schools, and many of them, including myself, have had experience as principals and district administrators. Over half of our professional staff have had experience teaching at the college or university level.

Last year, we had almost 1,100 external readers of NIE grant proposals; one-third of them were teachers or administrators, 38 percent represented minority groups, and 49 percent of those readers were women.

We encourage research/educator collaboration. I was pleased that Dr. Walker mentioned the CEMREL publication "Research Within Reach." That publication has been distributed to 50,000 teachers in this country, and is being used in colleges and universities, as well as public schools and private schools.

Recently, in fact this very week, Family Circle magazine printed a list of 25 books that they thought all parents in this country ought to have access to and read; one of them was an NIE publication which has just been issued called "Your Child and Testing," and we will leave this with the committee. This is free to parents across the country, and we have already distributed 100,000 copies.

We have published a little publication called "Plain Talk About School Finance." In fact, I just this week received a call from the Library of Congress asking us if this booklet could be used by high school debating societies all over America as a primer in school finance. This publication on school finance has been used by State legislatures to analyze their own programs. It is, in fact, leading to school finance reform in States across this country.

We funded a student learning team project to foster improved cooperation among students in desegregated schools to raise

achievement of the basic skills. That program is now being used in 3,000 schools in 1,500 school districts in this country.

Mr. Chairman, this committee approved of our progress in 1978. The conferees on this committee said, and I am quoting now, "NIE has matured into a unique and valuable resource for educators and policymakers alike." Two years later this same committee recommended and Congress approved extending NIE for 5 years and expanding its mission.

Let me take a minute now to talk about the $25 million. I can't pretend that the $25 million proposed by this committee will permit us to address the national goals outlined in our legislation. We will be able to do useful work in a limited number of critical areas, but we will not be, as this committee called us, a "unique and valuable national resource" with the capacity to examine a broad range of educational issues and problems.

We will have to cut back on some of the very programs that were given considerable credit by the earlier panel. We will cancel all of our institutional agreements. We will review each of them on a case-by-case basis, and examine the possibility that some limited number of these institutions might receive new agreements at reduced levels of funding.

We will support the national assessment of educational progress, which was remarked on this morning, but at a much reduced level. We will have modest programs in areas like reading and mathematics achievement, and technology. But we will eliminate entirely or greatly reduce research on writing instruction, adult literacy, bilingual education, foreign language acquisition, teacher education, evaluation, and youth employability.

We will have to cut back on 15 of the 16 ERIC clearinghouses which you heard discussed earlier. We will continue some awards to States for dissemination purposes, but we will have to drop regional programs serving 28 States and 9,000 educators.

We will have to ignore the 180,000 requests we receive yearly at the ERIC clearinghouses. We will have to eliminate advanced training programs for 600 minority men and women researchers which we have been running at the Institute.

We will do some work in the area of school finance and school management. We will have to eliminate work in legal and governmental studies, in rural education, in desegregation research, and youth policy studies.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to move very quickly.

I have noted the enormous investment our society has in education. I have described how I believe the National Institute of Education has made major contributions to the improvement of education in this country. I have told you of the effects of a drastic budget reduction on our ability to help State and local educators address the problems they face. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, we meet with those State and local educators on a regular basis.

We believe that the Federal responsibility for educational research, the accomplishments of NIE, and the significance of the work we are going to be forced to eliminate warrant support of our request for $61 million.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today, and I will be happy to respond to any questions you have.

[Prepared statement of Milton Goldberg follows:]

STATEMENT OF MILTON GOLDBERG, ACTING DIRECTOR, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the implications of the recommendations of this Committee with respect to funding for the National Institute of Education for fiscal year 1982.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Institute is currently operating under a budget for fiscal year 1981 of $65.6 million and the President has requested $61 million to continue the agency's programs in 1982. The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources has recommended that NIE have $59 million available in 1982, and this committee has recommended a drastic reduction to the level of $25 million. This amount severely impairs our ability to meet our Congressional mandate and continue serving education throughout this nation.

Mr. Chairman, education in this society is an enormous enterprise, perhaps the largest single activity in the country:

we spend about $200 billion per year on education in America, 8 percent of the gross national product, and that investment is central to maintaining our prominent position in the world;

one out of four individuals in our society is activity involved in education either as a student or as a teacher;

education is considered largely the responsibility of 56 states and territories and over 16,000 school districts;

NIE was created by statute in 1972 because it was felt that research and development in education could improve this great enterprise. It has, since then, been directed by Congress to specifically address several priority areas ranging from basic skills instruction to international education. The agency was created as a national Institute at the Federal level for several reasons:

the products of research in education are nationally usable and their costs should be nationally shared;

national support of research is more efficient than a system of trial and error by states and school districts;

it is in the Federal interest to insure that state, local, and Federal dollars invested in the education system are made with the fullest possible knowledge about the education process.

In response to the mandate from the Congress, we have created an Institute which pursues several goals:

to be a focal point for examining important national problems in education;

to provide knowledge about education to teachers, administrators, policymakers, parents, and students;

to provide leadership in improving education;

to anticipate new problems in order to be able to address them when they arise.

We have made extraordinary efforts to reach deeply into both the academic and local school communities to address the problems which concern all.

Let me cite some examples of the ways in which NIE has taken advantage of the talents of both researchers as well as teachers and school administrators:

Within NIE itself:

two-thirds of our professional staff possess the earned doctorate—mostly in the fields of education and psychology but also in such areas as linguistics, reading, statistics, and mathematics;

half of our professional staff have been classroom teachers in elementary or secondary schools and many of them have had experience as principals, or district administrators;

over half of the professional staff have had experience teaching at the college and university level;

of the 1,089 external readers of NIE grant proposals in 1980, one-third were teachers or administrators, 38 percent were minority and 49 percent were women.

In the educational community:

we support with multi-year awards 39 separate institutions, employing researchers and experienced educators, most focusing on specific issues such as reading, bilingual education, school finance, and the collection and dissemination of knowledge about research and effective educational practices;

forty-four state educational agencies requested multi-year awards to create their own dissemination offices in order to help school districts within their boundaries;

we support an Urban Superintendents Network comprised of 22 city school superintendents responsible for the education of 10 percent of the nation's school children.

The researcher/educator collaboration is also encouraged in specific projects. For example:

when we supported the publication of two books on reading and mathematics instruction (Research Within Reach), panels of teachers explained to researchers their most difficult problems in teaching reading or mathematics and then the researchers provided the best available research evidence on how to solve those problems. Twenty thousand copies of the first of these, on reading, have reached an estimated 50,000 teachers;

at the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University our contract calls not only for the support of research but also for the participation of teachers in the development and implementation of the research agenda.

I believe the collaboration I have described has resulted in significant accomplishments benefitting many audiences:

we completed in 1978, the first comprehensive evaluation of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which helped this Committee rewrite that statute;

our book, Your Child and Testing, is one of 25 books recommended to parents by this month's Family Circle Magazine;

Plain Talk About School Finance has been used for workshops in eleven states and we have also finished individual analyses leading to school finance reform in eleven states;

the International Reading Association provided 5,000 of its members with the publication on reading, Research Within Reach;

we funded a Student Team Learning program to foster improved cooperation amongst students in desegregated schools and to raise achievement in the basic skills—this program is so successful that it is now in use in 3,000 schools in 1,500 school districts in every state in the nation;

New York City's school improvement program was based on work on effective schools which we supported.

This Committee approved of our progress when, in 1978, the conferees on the Education Amendments, commented that NIE "has matured into a unique and valuable resource" for educators and policy-makers alike. Two years later this Committee recommended, and Congress approved, extending NIE for five years and expanding its mission.

Mr. Chairman, we were able to create a record of accomplishment because our resources were relatively stable following a major reduction in fiscal year 1974. They did not permit us to address all of the issues with which we were concerned. We did very little, for example, in the areas of early adolescent and early childhood education, or postsecondary education.

Nevertheless, the resources we had did permit us to address most of the mandates contained in our statute, and make major efforts in some of them.

It is significant, also, that relatively stable funding provided a measure of confidence to the research and education communities that when NIE committed itself to research and dissemination efforts they could expect those commitments to be met, and that we would support work of high quality which was available to educators when they needed it.

This is especially important in research which, by its very nature, is a long term enterprise.

The level of $25 million forces us to break both the continuity of the work we support and commitments we have made to the field.

I cannot pretend that the level of $25 million proposed by this Committee will permit us to address the national goals outlined in our legislation. We will be able to do useful work in a limited number of critical areas but we will not be a "unique and valuable national resource" with the capacity to examine a broad range of educational issues and problems.

Let me say generally how we would approach funding decisions at the level of $25 million and then say just a few words about the priority concerns we would support within each of our program areas.

First, in light of the fact that our "continuation base" for fiscal year 1982 is $56 million we would be forced to completely restructure our program to squeeze under the proposed $25 million ceiling. The continuation base is made up of commitments to the educational community, including institutional agreements with some 39 organizations, including labs and centers, and multi-year awards to individual researchers and other research organizations.

As as first step we would cancel all of our institutional agreements and review each of them on a case-by-case basis to examine the possibility that some limited number of these institutions might receive new agreements at greatly reduced levels depending upon the relationship of their work to the new priorities of the agency.

Individual multi-year awards that are now included in the continuation base would be continued if they fell within the few areas on which we will focus our work and discontinued if they did not.

Let me say just a work about the effects of the $25 million level on each of the three major program areas established in 1977:

Teaching and Learning.—At the level of $25 million, this program would receive $13.3 million, which would enable it to support the National Assessment of Educational Progress and modest programs in four areas: reading and mathematics achievement, technology in education, effective schools, and testing. We would eliminate entirely, or greatly reduce, research currenty underway on writing instruction, adult literacy, bilingual education, foreign language acquisition, teacher education, staff development, evaluation at the state and local levels, youth employability and home-school partnership. These activities were conceived to provide services to thousands of teachers and administrators, in all fifty states.

Our program on Dissemination and Improvement of Practice would be reduced by over two-thirds to $6.6 million. This level would permit us only to maintain the educational data base which is now available at over 600 locations around the country and is augmented by a system of sixteen subject-matter clearinghouses. For example, the ERIC clearinghouse concerned with reading collects information about research and practice in that area, and places it in the ERIC data base so that it can be available to researchers and teachers throughout the nation.

At the level of $25 million we could maintain the data base and access to it, but we would be forced to close fifteen of the sixteen clearinghouses leaving only a residual capacity to collect new material. We will continue 20 awards to states for dissemination purposes, but their awards will be reduced by 25 percent. We could, in addition fund a limited number of regional forums to inform state and local educators of research evidence on problems they define.

I might point out that this program provides wide ranging services to the education field. The reductions will require:

dropping regional programs serving 28 states, three territories, and 9,000 educators;

ignoring approximately 180,000 requests for assistance received at the ERIC Clearinghouses each year; and

eliminating advanced training opportunities for some 600 minority and women researchers.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, our program on Educational Policy and Organization supports a wide array of activities in school finance, legal and governmental studies, youth policy, school management, and education for young adolescents.

At the level the committee is recommending, this program would receive only $5.1 million in fiscal 1982. This level would permit us to focus on the area of school finance, including the area of postsecondary education finance and school organization and management. But we would be forced to eliminate virtually all other areas where research is currently underway. This includes such important work as school management studies, research on postsecondary organization and management, legal and governmental studies, rural education, desegregation research, youth policy, and the newly legislated priority on early adolescence.

We believe that the Federal responsibility for educational research, the accomplishments of NIE, and the significance of the work we will be forced to eliminate warrant support of the President's request for $61 million.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify and will be happy to respond to any questions you might have.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Doctor.

Dr. Minter.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS MINTER, PH. D., DEPUTY CHANCELLOR OF INSTRUCTION, NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MINTER. Good morning, Chairman Murphy, and members of the committee.

I am Thomas K. Minter, and I am the deputy chancellor for instruction in the New York City Public Schools, and I am presenting the testimony of Chancellor Frank J. Macchiarola.

Though I will dispense with the introduction on the first page, I would like to read the remaining pages. I will do it quickly, but I think as a practitioner, and as one who is representing the largest school system in this Nation, there are some factors and some points here that we would like to make.

I am told that the United States spends between $12 and $14 billion a year on defense research, and $3 billion on energy research. I have no quarrel with these expenditures, but I think that it is appropriate to point out that undergirding all research is our basic education system. If that foundation is weak, ultimately we will pay the price in our ability to conduct advanced research.

The ultimate cost of neglecting basic education research extends well beyond our capacities for scientific, defense, and industrial technologies. It goes to the core of our democratic society. If we cannot teach all of our children and if we cannot do it within the resources available, then we are heading down a path I find disheartening and even frightening.

Now for some good news. Recently I was able to announce that for the first time in 12 years, the reading scores of our students in New York City this year exceeded the national average. We believe that the support and direction of Federal programs, particularly those such as ESEA title I, which focus on intensive basic skills training for those students who cannot keep pace with their peers, have been a critical catalyst in producing this degree of success.

We are relying on the continuation of such support to implement a new system of retention and concentrated services for those students in the fourth and seventh grades whose scores fall significantly below grade level. Federal moneys will not provide the sole foundation for this new program, but certainly will be an essential ingredient.

Another highly visible asset of the categorical programs has been the introduction of comprehensive evaluation both as a routine practice for measuring the results of particular educational services and as a method of building upon proven successes and revising ineffective classroom activities.

The rise in student test scores and the internalization of evaluation are just two example of the substantial and validated benefits of the current philosophical and financial structure of Federal education aid.

The National Institute of Education has played the major role in evaluating our most valuable Federal programs, including title I, vocational education, and the conditions of violence and vandalism in our schools. Their evaluations have validated for the Congress and for the administration the worth and successes of these programs, and have therefore provided a necessary rationale for keeping these programs alive.

NIE's present philosophical orientation is toward assisting us in the understanding and replicating of effective schools. This is a high priority for NIE, as it is for me.

Let me add a word parenthetically as a skeptic of some education research. Determining what it is that works in schools is not

simply a question of commonsense, contrary to what some would like to believe. The issues and the systems are complex and the answers will not come cheaply, nor will they come from our individual school sytems working in a vacuum. We need the sharing of information made possible by NIE.

One of NIE's genuine successes, in my estimation, is the urban superintendents network, of which I am a member. The network consists of about 20 superintendents from urban school districts across the Nation. Urban school districts are unique in the educational community—54 percent of the school districts nationwide have fewer than 1,000 students. May I emphasize, 54 percent of school districts, most of our schools have no more than 1,000 pupils. There are only 212 districts out of 16,000 with 25,000 or more pupils.

New York City public schools enroll approximately 960,000 students. The next two largest school systems, Chicago and Los Angeles, when combined are about equal enrollment to New York City.

The urban superintendents network meets periodically for sessions which concentrate on specific topics such as bilingual education, or the education of the handicapped. Our sessions are uniformly stimulating and productive. An excellent measure of the attitude of urban superintendents toward this network is that attendance is so high.

In addition to our regular responsibilities, most of us are involved in a veritable host of associations, committees, task forces, and commissions, and the number of meetings and conferences to which we are invited is mind boggling.

For me, and I think for most of my colleagues, the urban superintendents network is the single most useful forum for the exchange of information and for common problem solving. NIE deserves much credit for making this possible.

There are many other specific programs with which NIE has been involved, as I am sure you will hear from other witnesses. Suffice it to say that NIE is increasingly involved with innovative but practical efforts pertinent to all schools, including urban schools.

I support NIE's philosophical orientation and I hope that the members of this subcommittee will do everything possible to sustain the Institute at a level which will enable it to continue to function. Funding for the Institute is an investment in the future of our schools and of our children.

Thank you for your attention.

[Prepared statement of Frank J. Macchiarola follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF FRANK J. MACCHIAROLA, CHANCELLOR, NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Chairman Murphy and members of the subcommittee, good morning. My name is Frank J. Macchiarola and I am chancellor of the New York City Public Schools. I want to thank you for the opportunity to discuss the National Institute of Education.

I was most distressed to learn that members of the Education and Labor Committee have agreed to cut two-thirds of the Institute's budget. It does not appear possible for the Institute to accomplish its national mission at a level of $25 million.

In light of the current fiscal climate, I can appreciate attempts to slice all budgets, but this reduction appears to me disproportionate.

The National Institute of Education performs the only Federal research function in education. While current political vogue advocates that all Federal functions be

returned to States and localities, States and localities do not have the capacity to perform this particular function. Research and dissemination are a legitimate Federal function and should remain so.

I am told that the United States spends between $12 and $14 billion a year on defense research and $3 billion on energy research. I have no quarrel with these expenditures, but I think it is appropriate to point out that undergirding all research is our basic education system. If that foundation is weak, ultimately we will pay the price in our ability to conduct advanced research. The ultimate cost of neglecting basic education research extends well beyond our capacities for scientific, defense, and industrial technologies: It goes to the core of our democratic society. If we cannot teach all of our children and if we cannot do it within the resources available, then we are heading down a path I find disheartening and even frightening.

Now for some good news. Recently I was able to announce that for the first time in twelve years, in New York City our students' reading scores this year exceeded the national average. We believe that the support and direction of Federal programs, particularly those such as ESEA Title I which focus on intensive basic skills training for those students who cannot keep pace with their peers, have been a critical catalyst in producing this degree of success.

We are relying on the continuation of such support to implement a new system of retention and concentrated services for those students in the fourth and seventh grades whose scores fall significantly below grade level. Federal monies will not provide the sole foundation for this new program, but certainly will be an essential ingredient.

Another highly visible asset of the categorical programs has been the introduction of comprehensive evaluation both as a routine practice for measuring the results of particular educational services and as a method of building upon proven successes and revising ineffective classroom activities.

The rise in students' test scores and the internalizing of evaluation are just two examples of the substantial and validated benefits of the current philosophical and financial structure of Federal education aid.

The National Institute of Education has played the major role in evaluating our most valuable Federal programs, including title I, vocational education, and the conditions of violence and vandalism in our schools. Their evaluations have validated for the Congress and for the administration the worth and successes of these programs, and have therefore provided a necessary rationale for keeping these programs alive.

NIE's present philosophical orientation is toward assisting us in understanding and replicating effective schools. This is a high priority for NIE., as it is for me. Let me add a word parenthetically as a skeptic of some education research. Determining what it is that works in schools is not simply a question of common sense, contrary to what some would like to believe. The issues and the systems are complex and the anwers will not come cheaply. Nor will they come from our individual school systems working in a vacuum. We need the sharing of information made possible by NIE.

One of NIE's genuine successes, in my estimation, is the Urban Superintendents Network, of which I am a member. The network consists of about twenty superintendents from urban school districts across the Nation.

Urban school districts are unique in the educational community. Fifty-four percent of the school districts nationwide have fewer than 1,000 students. There are only 212 districts out of 16,000 with 25,000 or more pupils.

New York City public schools enroll approximately 960,000 students. The next two largest school systems, Chicago and Los Angeles, when combined, are about equal in enrollment to New York.

The Urban Superintendents Network meets periodically for sessions which concentrate on specific topics such as bilingual education or education of the handicapped. Our sessions are uniformly stimulating and productive. An excellent measure of the attitude of Urban Superintendents toward this network is that attendance is so high. In addition to our regular responsibilities, most of us are involved in a veritable host of associations, committees, task forces, and commissions, and the number of meetings and conferences to which we are invited is mindboggling. For me, and I think for most of my colleagues, the Urban Superintendents' Network is the single most useful forum for the exchange of information and for common problem-solving. NIE deserves much credit for making this possible.

There are many other specific programs with which NIE has been involved as I am sure you will hear from other witnesses. Suffice it to say that NIE is increasingly involved with innovative but practical efforts pertinent to all schools, including urban schools. I support NIE's philosophical orientation and I hope that the mem-

bers of this subcommittee will do everthing possible to sustain the Institute at a level which will enable it to continue to function. Funding for the Institute is an investment in the future of our schools and of our children.

Thank you for your attention.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Dr. Minter.

Dr. Maxine Greene.

STATEMENT OF MAXINE GREENE, PH. D., PRESIDENT, AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Ms. GREENE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My full testimony is available, and I will summarize very briefly, and try not to repeat what has already been said.

I am pleased to represent the American Educational Research Association, an organization of almost 14,000 people engaged in all forms of educational inquiry and research around the country.

My name is Maxine Greene, and I am a professor of philosophy and education at Teachers College, Columbia University. It happens that I spend considerable time working with teachers, frequently in the New York City schools, and I have never received a grant from the National Institute of Education.

We are here to try to clarify the status and accomplishments of educational research as we understand it, and to appeal the 68-percent reduction, that has been lamented by many of us already, in the budget authority proposed by the House Education and Labor Committee.

There is considerable irony, even tragic irony, at least as we see it, in the fact that these cuts are coming when educational research and development is showing itself to be most productive due largely, we believe, to improvements in the way research is being conducted, no longer at distance from the schools in sterile, safe laboratories, but in close cooperation with teachers, administrators, policymakers, and others on the frontline.

I think we, even those of us who have been guilty of the crime, are very sensitive to the jargon question that you have raised and are paying heed to it, and to the problem of communication.

We are very interested in the fact that NIE, for all its difficulties in the way of funding, is itself much concerned with the question of dissemination and the problem of communication.

My own interests happen to be in various kinds of literacy, ranging from computer literacy to aesthetic literacy to technological literacy. When I think of increasing the quality or improving the quality of education, I think of raising the levels of literacy in many, many dimensions, and regret particularly the ways in which these efforts will be frustrated.

NIE funds, limited though they have been, have clearly, as we see it, expanded the knowledge base being used by teachers, by policymakers, by others, and have affected the ways in which people think about teaching and learning.

I am aware of the reports about people going into education being mediocre. This is a very, very old story. I remember this even when I was a child. Those who can't write, teach; those who can't act, teach, so on and so on.

It is true that the latest reports show that the more competent women are not going into teaching. But I believe that if education is presented not as a narrowly technical enterprise, if education is

understood to be an undertaking informed by theory, those people who are becoming teachers certainly are much more likely to rise above mediocrity.

I really don't believe in determinism. I think all sorts of things are possible, even by the poor person who purportedly can't write and, therefore, teaches.

I think that the contributions NIE has made in enabling teachers to think anew about teaching and learning, to inform their own undertakings with some kind of thoughtfulness, cannot but continue to raise the level.

I think clearly that a shift in support is likely to affect the whole field of inquiry, the growing ability to provide timely information to teachers.

Finally, I can only add to what my colleagues have said. We believe that NIE's priorities are in line with this country's crucial concern, which is raising the level of literacy in many fields, raising skill mastery, improving local practice, and understanding much more about the effectiveness of schools.

Since so much of what we had in mind has been said, I will stop now and thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of Maxine Greene follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MAXINE GREENE, PH. D., PRESIDENT, AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman: I am pleased to be here to represent the nearly 14,000 members of the American Educational Research Association. My name is Maxine Greene; I am President of the Association and Professor of Education, Teacher's College, Columbia University. Our Association members are enaged in all forms of educational inquiry in every part of this nation.

We appear here both to clarify the status and accomplishments of educational research and appeal the threat to federal support for educational R&D by the Education and Labor Committee's 68 percent reduction in funding authority for the National Institute of Education. The federal government is the principal sponsor of educational research. This dramatic shift in support, if sustained in the reconciliation process, will result in potential damage to children and youth and the educational institutions which serve them.

It is a tragic irony that support for educational inquiry is being undercut just when research efforts are beginning to pay off in significant ways. In short, funds provided for the National Instutite of Education are not just buying potential benefits; they have already secured a greatly expanded knowledge base being effectively used by learners, teachers, parents, administrators, and legislators. Educational research in general and NIE in particular have reputations which have not kept pace with their achievements in understanding the complex, labor intensive, and vast human enterprise called education.

These gains have, in large measure, been due to the major metamorphosis, some would call it a "revolution," in the way educational research is conducted. Through NIE-funded projects, we have shifted from distant analysis to direct engagement with the problems and concerns which students and educators face every day. We have less concerned with creating ideal settings and more concerned with providing knowledge and information specifically needed to improve schools, colleges, and classrooms in the wide variety of settings in which they exist. We have also learned to extract much of the wisdom of successful teachers and administrators; and, to our great joy, we have learned to be useful and provide usable knowledge resources to those in the front lines of educational practice.

We are also getting better at delivering timely and useful information to the Congress, state legislators, boards of education, and other decison makers. We cannot make the value judgments for which they are elected or appointed; however, we can help protect the consequences of alternative decisions. Our research studies have also uncovered current and potential problems to which NIE's research plans are now being addressed.

The major themes and priorities of the Institute are directly in line with the salient concerns of American education: Literacy and The Acquisition of Academic

Skills, Improvement of Local Educational Practice, and Effective Schools. The accomplishments made by NIE demonstrate that the federal government can, without attempts at centralized control or direction, advance the quality of education. The limited investments in educational research have produced the following specific benefits (supported in whole or part by NIE):

BASIC SKILL IMPROVEMENT

Thousands of schools have used research-based approaches to improvement of reading and mathematics in the primary grades. The National Assessment of Educational Progress has recently reported significant increases in elementary grade test scores (particularly for poor and minority students); New York City (along with Chicago) is using a "mastery learning" strategy designed to reach and enable progress for every student (NYC has just reported that their achievement scores have exceeded national averages for the first time in a dozen years). Efforts to improve instruction have been developed from our understanding of the use of instructional time and how it can be effectively managed.

COMPLEX ACADEMIC TASKS

Studies on test score decline (beginning in the middle and secondary grades) have enabled us to identify the causes of learning problems. For example, the "back-to-basics" movement focused on simple skills like word recognition (decoding), math computation, and simple sentence structure. NIE's grant and contract competitions are specifically focused on studies to improve the necessary (and more complex) tasks of reading comprehension, mathematics problem solving, and written composition.

READING COMPREHENSION

The Center for the Study of Reading, for example, has specifically identified a major cause of reading problems. That is, basic reading texts have not devoted attention to content and context, the major ingredients for improvement in comprehension. In a recent Terrytown, N.Y. conference with publishers, the Center was intrumental in gaining support for improving reading texts. The Center is also conducting "comprehension instruction" seminars for teachers and plans major service programs in city school systems.

TEACHER AND RESEACHERS COLLABORATION

The Institute for Research on Teaching, by collaborating directly with classroom teachers, has greatly increased teachers' understanding of the way they use available instructional time, manage classrooms, and rely on curricular materials. The Institute has also analysed such materials to demonstrate how they affect both what is learned and how texts and tests shape the content of instruction.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

"Effective schools" studies have already identified common characteristics of successful schools operating in difficult circumstances. Further work is underway to increase the number of schools able to gain and maintain such attributes, e.g., (1) academically focused school leadership, (2) safe and orderly climate, (3) total staff/faculty dedication to academic achievement as the fundamental school mission, (4) teacher expectations that all students (regardless of background) can learn, and (5) a system of frequent monitoring of learner performance (tied to specific efforts to meet individual learning problems).

INTEGRATION OF MANAGEMENT, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND EFFECTIVE SCHOOL STUDIES

Given the promising results of the effective schools studies, NIE is working across the Institute to match organization management and dissemination studies to determine alternative ways for schools to adopt these effective characteristics.

MATH AND SCIENCE LEARNING

NIE, in collaboration with the National Science Foundation, supports studies on mathematics teaching, the use of calculators and microprocessors, and the understanding of student approaches to science. This work has already pointed out ways to harness new information and communications technologies for learning. These

studies have also helped math and science teachers understand the way students can use errors to correct misinterpretations and increase intellectual skills.

NEW LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES

Note: The NIE "microprocessor" (minicomputers, calculators) studies are focused on the adaptation of these learning devices for classroom use. Unless schools are able to provide experience with small computers, they could be the seeds of a new economic segregation (as more affluent parents purchase them for home use). It is also likely that the entertainment industry may dominate the use of this technology, if such studies and uses are neglected.

TESTING—USES FOR INSTRUCTION

NIE's work on testing has produced important information for parents and teachers on how to interpret and use test results for instructional improvement among young learners. The Institute for Research on Teaching, for example, has produced kits for teachers in the Overseas Dependent Schools. The success with this effort is leading commercial publishers to consider production and marketing for the schools in this country.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF TEST ISSUES

NIE is also actively working to assist state and local policymakers to understand the pros and cons of minimum competency testing. This July, a hearing (in the form of team presentations and debate) will be conducted in Washington, with major portions broadcast over public television stations. NIE is also making concerted efforts to gain a general understanding of testing, "truth-in-testing" legislation, test bias, teacher competency testing, and other important issues facing education. Workshops have been held for parents, school board members, state legislators, journalists, and others. A public and a parent's guide to testing and test use have been widely distributed.

SERVICES TO THE CONGRESS

NIE has managed education policy studies in the areas of compensatory education (Title I, ESEA), basic skills, bilingual education, "safe schools" (reports on school violence and effective ways to reduce it), education and youth unemployment, rural schools, and public and private high schools, which have been used by the Congress. The Congressional Research Service and General Accounting Office have also used NIE-supported studies and reports to prepare information requested by members and committees of the Congress. Important studies on vocational education and school finance are currently underway.

FINANCE STUDIES

NIE, through cooperative arrangements with the National Council of State Legislators and the Education Commission of the States is providing comparative information to all states on school finance plans, tax wealth among states, and ways to improve education finance policies. Current finance studies, supported or conducted by NIE, are exploring ways to index cost variance among school districts and to determine ways that federal funding affects state school aid.

TRANSLATION OF FINDINGS INTO USABLE FORMS

Over the past several years, NIE has engaged in a concentrated effort to report accumulated evidence in forms understandable to educators, parents, and policymakers. Through information centers (known as "Education Research Information Centers—ERIC), NIE has created "user files" specifically designed to help teachers and administrators understand the latest research results. NIE has also produced clearly understood summary reports on functional literacy, the uses of teacher and learner time, tests, school finance, and so on. In addition, NIE works through an Urban Superintendent's Network and state education agencies to enhance the communication of research-based information to local and state educators.

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

NIE-supported NAEP, operated by the Education Commission of the States provides the public, parents, legislators, and educators with a barometer of student progress in the areas of reading, writing, math, civics, science, and other important areas of schooling. The development of testing items by NAEP has also enabled

states to use NAEP tests for state and local achievement measures. NIE is also using the data from the regional and national NAEP studies to analyse specific problems where increased instruction or improved teaching are needed. For example, follow-up studies on the writing exam indicate that the basic problem for advanced achievement is the lack of writing instruction and practice, particularly in the development of compositions.

HIGHER EDUCATION STUDIES

Management and finance studies are being used by higher education officials to plan for new student populations (particularly older and part-time students, returning adults, and career-entry professional studies of women). Current studies on fiscal management are helping higher education officials to increase the use of available resources and to manage the decline in financial support.

INTERNATIONAL AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDIES

Following the inclusion of these studies as an added congressional priority (included in the 1980 five-year reauthorization of the Institute), NIE is seeking ways to increase our understanding of learning and teaching in these areas. Cost-effective strategies to pursue ways to increase the acquisition of foreign languages and understanding of other countries and cultures is already planned.

These examples represent only part of the NIE effort to meet its mandate to improve education policy and practice through research and development.

LIMITED RESOURCES FOR NIE

These accomplishments, while extensive, have been achieved with severely constrained financial resources. Congress has mandated 8 priority area of study for NIE: (1) basic skills, (2) management, finance and productivity, (3) education and work, (4) educational equity, (5) early adolescents and their schools, (6) older and part-time postsecondary students, (7) education of foreign languages and countries, and (8) the dissemination and use of evidence produced from R. & D. studies. Yet, NIE has never been provided adequate resources to fully meet the knowledge and information needs of American education, the nation's largest single enterprise involving nearly a third of the population and investments of $166 billion. NIE, in fact, had more funds (in actual dollars) during its initial year (fiscal year 1973, $103 million) than it currently spends ($65.6 million in fiscal year 1981, following a $8.5 million rescission).

NIE, the major source of R. & D. funding in the Education Department, represents less than 0.05 percent of the total Education Department budget. Less than 0.09 percent of the Department's budget goes to all forms of educational R. & D. and evaluation. This compares to 10 percent in defense, 3 percent in agriculture, 45 percent in energy, and 5.5 percent of the Health budget. In fiscal year 1980 with $74 million, NIE was able to support 465 contracts and grants. By comparison, the National Institutes of Health (fiscal year 1980 funds, over $3.6 billion) was able to support 5,000 research grants in addition to training grants and significant work done on the NIH campus. Due to inflation, NIE's purchasing power amounts to less than 28 cents on its original fiscal year 1973 funding dollar.

WHAT HAS NOT BEEN DONE

Clearly, NIE could have done more if it had just maintained its original budget. The Institute has concentrated on the most salient needs of basic skills in the primary grades, where much of its work has paid off. However, planned competitions in the uses of technology, secondary schools, higher education, and learning in non-school settings have been delayed or severely cut back. In fiscal year 1981, planned competitions in teaching and learning, for example, attracted nearly 700 proposals. Prior to the rescission, the Institute would have only been able to support 65 to 70 of these projects, (over 200 proposals or 30 percent were rated by peer review panels as clearly deserving support). Over 40 proposals were submitted for one award to study education and training in business and industry and 251 proposals were submitted in four grant competitions in the areas of organization and management, law and government, desegregation, and postsecondary management and finance. All of this work is threatened by the recently enacted rescission. Similar work on rural schools, return on postsecondary education investments, basic skills and youth policy, and the cooperation of higher education and corporate institutions have been reduced to single studies or syntheses of available knowledge.

NIE clearly represents a cost-effective investment of Federal funds. The Institute has wisely chosen to devote its resources to the most salient education needs;

however, it has sacrificed efforts to publicize its accomplishments. In order to disseminate information and products in cost-effective ways, the Institute has (1) worked with professional associations of math, science, reading, and English teachers; (2) provided funds to state education agencies and local school systems; (3) served publishers with information and ways to improve texts and other learning materials; (4) funded R. & D. exchanges among regional laboratories and school systems; and (5) worked with higher education, state legislator, school board, and administrator associations and organizations. Few of these efforts have provided NIE with the public credit it deserved.

NIE has had to cut back on its own publications program and has been forced to rely on traditional, often slow, channels of research communication, e.g., through journals, professional meetings, and seminars. NIE has never been able to support research training programs, with the exception of a small program for minority and women researchers. Summer workshops with teachers and administrators, a productive means of communicating new findings, have been planned but never implemented. In short, NIE has suffered from a lack of understanding of its own accomplishments. Although nearly 100 professional, parent, public interest, science, and institutional associations cosponsor an annual coalition statement in support of the Institute's appropriation, the Congress often has chosen to sacrifice increased funding for research in order to support direct service programs.

Major Work Needed for the 1980's (threatened by reconciliation).

Improvement of Education Quality is the major theme of the 1980's. NIE has planned major efforts to extend its successes in the primary sector to meet important educational concerns in the following areas:

Improvement of secondary education (jr. and sr. high schools);

Preparing learners for new demands of literacy (e.g., coping with technology in education and the workplace);

Reversing the decline in math and science learning;

Improving urban and rural schools in economically depressed areas;

Improving academic skills for unemployed youth, particularly among urban minorities and those in isolated rural areas;

Providing English language acquisition for the new wave of immigrants and other language minority children;

Increasing productivity in corporations and human service industries through improved education and training;

Adapting informational technologies to enhance school learning;

Improving the academic skills of our military forces, in order to deal with increasingly sophisticated equipment and operations;

Increased understanding of global interdependence and knowledge of foreign countries (governments and cultures);

Reversing the decline in understanding of our own history, culture, and democratic system of government.

In addition to these issues, a flood of education policy issues faces legislators and administrators at the local, state, and federal levels. Decisions for these policymakers include the public support of private education, inter-governmental relations in education, regulation and administrative burden (including the regulation of research in higher education institutions), school costs and finance, labor and management relations, organizational improvement, the use of limited fiscal and human resources, and educational contributions to productivity.

DECISIONS FACING THE CONGRESS

The reconciliation process threatens to all but curtail federal support for the Institute. The fiscal year 1982 funding authority for NIE is between $25 million reported by the House Education and Labor Committee and $59 million by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. The Administration requested $61 million.

We strongly request the Select Education Subcommittee initiate a bipartisan effort to meet at least the Administration request when reconciliation legislation reaches the floor of the House. If that is not possible, we hope that the full Senate amount be adopted in the conference report on reconciliation.

With $60 million, the Institute can preserve the most pressing priorities until more adequate funding is allocated.

As noted at the outset, the federal government is the principal sponsor of educational inquiry. No other level of government and no private sector industrial R & D. base are willing and capable of supporting the range of research and development efforts demanded by the nation's educational enterprise.

Schools, as demonstrated by recently reported achievement measures, are making significant gains and improvements. This trend must continue if the nation is to

retain a literate population. Support for educational research is a necessary component in the national effort to improve the quality of learning. Withdrawal of federal support will fragment the research efforts and leave educators and policymakers to cope with limited or obsolete information and understanding. This would be counterproductive to the future needs of the nation, its children and youth.

TESTIMONY HIGHLIGHTS OF DR. MAXINE GREENE, AERA PRESIDENT AND PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

AERA is an umbrella organization representing nearly 14,000 individuals engaged in nearly every form of educational research and related inquiry (members located in universities, state and local education agencies, independent R. & D. organizations, legislative committee staff (state or federal), business, industry, military R. & D., and other locations.

Purpose of presentation: Clarify status and accomplishments of educational research and appeal 68 percent reduction in National Institute of Education's budget authority proposed by the House Education and Labor Committee.

Key Points in General: Cuts come just when educational research and development is being most productive, largely due to a major improvement in the conduct of research (working closely with teachers, administrators, policymakers, and others in the front lines of education).

Funds for NIE are not just buying potential benefits; they have already, with limited resources, secured a much expanded knowledge base being used by educators, legislators, and other decisionmakers in education.

NIE has demonstrated that the Federal Government, without central control or direction, can advance educational quality through research, development, and evaluation.

Federal government is principal sponsor of educational research, unlike support for educational operations. Therefore, a major shift in support dramatically affects the entire field of inquiry and the ability to provide timely and useful information.

NIE already is underfunded (fiscal year 1973 budget in first year, $103 million; fiscal year 1981, after $8.5 million rescission, $65.6 million). Against this constraint, NIE has been remarkably productive (see below).

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION—FUNDED R. & D.

Basic Skill Improvement.—Reading and math test scores in the primary grades are on the rise, particularly in low income urban and rural areas. These gains, in large measure, have been due to research-based strategies to improve the direct instruction of these children.

Needed Academic Skills.—NIE work is affecting changes in basic reading texts to improve comprehension and instructional strategies to focus on these essential skills. Similar improvements in mathematics problem-solving and written composition are in progress because of NIE supported studies.

Effective Schools.—Studies have identified common characteristics of successful schools operating in difficult circumstances and NIE is now working to discover ways for other schools to adopt these effective instructional and organizational strategies.

Math and Science Learning.—Specific work on student approaches to science and the study of mathematics are being used by math and science teacher groups to improve instruction. NIE is also improving teachers' understanding of the use of calculators and other learning devices to enhance instruction. Uses of Microprocessors. NIE is cooperating with NSF in studies on the adaptation of minicomputers to assist school learning.

Testing and use of test results.—Studies and reports have been used to increase parent and teacher understanding of tests, test results, and the ways they can be used to diagnose learning problems. NIE specifically supports efforts to assist legislators, school boards, and interested publics understand test issues, e.g., minimum competency testing, truth-in-testing, and teacher tests.

Services to the Congress.—NIE has managed national policy studies on Title I, safe schools, bilingual education, basic skills, and education of unemployed youth (among others). These studies have been used by congressional committees. The Congressional Research Service and General Accounting Office use NIE-sponsored studies to prepare reports to the Congress.

Finance and Management Studies.—Policy studies on school finance are being used by state legislators, school boards, state education agencies, the Congress, and a variety of interested publics. Management studies, on the effective use of available

(sometimes declining) resources, are being used by school and college leaders across the country.

Higher Education Management Studies.—Are being used to assist those institutions to cope with changing student populations (older, part-time students) and to manage fiscal resources among state institutions.

International and Foreign Language Study.—With limited funds, NIE is seeking cost-effective ways of assisting schools and colleges to improve the learning of foreign languages and about foreign nations and cultures.

LARGE DEMANDS AND LIMITED RESOURCES

Congress has mandated a major mission, improving American education through research and development, and many priorities for NIE. Yet, funds for the Institute currently purchase about 28 cents on the initial fiscal year 1973 NIE appropriation. As noted before, funds have not kept pace with the demands for information. NIE represents 0.05 percent of the Education Department budget (all funds for R. & D. in the Department account for 0.09 percent of the ED appropriation). By comparison, 10 percent of the defense, 45 percent of the energy, 3 percent of the agriculture, and 5.5 percent of the health budgets go for R. & D.

NIE supported 465 grants and contracts in fiscal year 1980, compared to 5,000 research grants in the National Institutes of Health (not counting training grants and work done on the NIH campus).

NIE has never been able to support more than 9 percent of the proposals submitted for research and development competitions. In the past several years nearly 30 percent of such proposals have been rated by peer review panels (including researchers and practitioners in education) as deserving of support.

NIE has worked with other organizations (state education agencies, legislators, school boards, teacher groups, laboratories, institutions of higher education, urban superintendents, and so on) to carry the information from its funded studies. Since NIE has a very limited publication and public information budget, it has chosen these cost-effective ways to disseminate its work (at the sacrifice of its own publicity).

EDUCATION QUALITY AND THE 1980'S

NIE's work is directly planned to meet the salient need to advance quality in specific areas of concern: (1) jr. and sr. high schools; (2) new demands for literacy in eduction and the workplace; (3) economically depressed urban and rural schools; (4) basic skills to improve youth employment; (5) reversing the decline in math and science, history and government, foreign language, and international understanding; (6) providing English language skills to new immigrants and language minority students; (7) adapting information and communication technologies for academic learning; and (8) improving eduction and training to enhance productivity in industry, the military, and human service delivery.

These efforts to build on the R. & D. achievments (noted above) are threatened by the reconciliation of NIE's budget authority.

We urge the Congress to adopt a House floor amendment which would elevate the Institute's funding authority to an amount no lower than the President's budget request of $61 million for fiscal year 1982. If that is not done, we hope that the Select Education Subcommittee will lead a bipartisan effort to adopt the Senate amount of $59 million in the reconciliation conference report.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Dr. Greene.

We have had two other requests to present summaries of their testimony, and to submit testimony for the record. We would like both of them to present their testimony now.

Dr. Richard Anderson of the University of Illinois, would you like to take this chair over here. Also, Mrs. Alice McDonald, deputy superintendent of public instruction, Kentucky Department of Education. We would ask Mrs. McDonald if she has a summary of her statement at this time.

STATEMENT OF ALICE McDONALD, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mrs. McDONALD. Congressman Murphy and members of this distinguished subcommittee, it is a distinct privilege for me to appear before you today.

I am Alice McDonald, deputy superintendent of public instruction in the Kentucky Department of Public Education, and a member of the National Council on Educational Research, which is the statutory policy body of the National Institute of Education.

I appear before you today to speak about the importance of educational research and what it has meant to education and will continue to mean to one of the largest enterprises in America. And I further wish to express my great concern that educational research be funded at a level higher than that recommended by this committee.

As deputy superintendent of public instruction in a State which has all manner of school districts, ranging from Appalachian rural to large urban districts, and from my 20 years in the field of education, beginning as a teacher in Chalmette, La., I have talked to a lot of people who have continuing concerns about education.

As a member of the executive committee of the National Democratic Party, I am aware of the great and continuing concern of people from all across this country for the improvement of education.

I am well aware of the current pressures and concerns at the local, State, and national levels for the continuation and the improvement of the many great social programs established during the last 20 years, including education.

This committee, which has sponsored so much education legislation, also established NIE because Congress has recognized that research is an integral part of the Federal role in improving educational services at the State and local levels.

Education in America is a $200 billion enterprise—25 percent of the population is involved in the business of education. We spend less than 1 percent of that total amount of money on educational research. We spend much less on educational research than we spend on research in other sectors of our society.

While there is no magic number of dollars for educational research, the budget request before the Congress of $61 million is less than 25 percent of what the 1973 budget for educational research would purchase. NIE has been pared down in the past. I believe, however, that we must maintain funding at a level that is reasonable and will support and sustain the kind of research we need to effectively improve the quality of education in America.

I am aware that the President has proposed a $61 million level budget, and the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources has recommended $59 million. These levels are more reasonable to support the kind of educational research that is needed to help NIE meet the broad mandate from Congress to work on the concerns in education through legislation sponsored by this committee and supported by educational communities, such as the National Association of State Boards of Education, Council on Chief State

School Officers, teacher organizations, and the Parent and Teacher Association.

I urge you to fund educational research at a level that will allow us to continue to find the ways to improve the quality of education, thereby improving the quality of life for people in America.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Alice McDonald follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ALICE MCDONALD, DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Congressman Murphy and members of this distinguished subcommittee, it is a distinct privilege for me to appear before you today. I am Alice McDonald, deputy superintendent of pubic instruction in the Kentucky Department of Education, and a member of the National Council on Educational Research which is the statutory policy body of the National Institute of Education.

I appear before you today to speak about the importance of educational research and what it has meant to education and will continue to mean to one of the largest enterprises in America. And I further wish to express my great concern that educational research be funded at a level higher than that recommended by this committee.

As deputy superintendent of public instruction in a State which has all manner of school districts ranging from Appalachian rural to large urban districts, and from my twenty years in the field of education beginning in Chalmette, La. I talk to a lot of people who have continuing concerns about education. As a member of the executive committee of the National Democratic Party, I am aware of the great and continuing concern of people from all across this country for the improvement of education. I am well aware of the current pressures and concerns at the local, State, and national levels for the continuation and the improvement of the many great social programs established during the last twenty years including education.

At this time of great financial pressure, we need good ideas and tested ways of being more efficient as well as methods for improving education programs. Educational research can help us achieve this. It can provide us with the ideas and techniques to more effectively and efficiently utilize our current resources.

Educational research is a service to education, parents, and students because it is a way of understanding educational problems and developing effective solutions to those problems.

This committee which has sponsored so much education legislation also established NIE because Congress has recognized that research is an integral part of the Federal role in improving educational services at the State and local level.

In the past decade alone, educational research has provided information which has been used across the Nation to improve programs in testing, reading, and mathematics.

In the State of Kentucky we have effectively utilized educational research to improve the progress of children in reading and mathematics. We have helped teachers through utilizing educational research improve the performance of children in the middle grades in reading comprehension. Our test scores reflect this improvement. The test scores of Kentucky's children have been continuously improving. In our rural disadvantaged and economically deprived districts, the children have made substantial progress. There is no doubt that educational research has been instrumental in the progress that has been made.

Education in America is a $200 billion enterprise. Twenty-five percent of the population is involved in the business of education. We spend less than 1 percent of that total amount of money on educational research. We spend much less on educational research than we spend on research in other sectors of our society.

While there is no magic number of dollars for educational research, the budget request before the Congress of sixty-one million dollars is less than 25 percent of what the 1973 budget for educational research would purchase. NIE has been pared down in the past. I believe, however, that we must maintain funding at a level that is reasonable and will support and sustain the kind of research we need to effectively improve the quality of education in America.

I am aware that the President has proposed a sixty-one million dollar level budget and the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources has recommended fifty-nine million. These levels are more reasonable to support the kinds of educational research that is needed to help NIE meet the broad mandate from Congress to work on the concerns in education through legislation sponsored by this committee and supported by educational communities, such as the National Association of State

Boards of Education, Council of Chief State School Officers, teachers organizations, and the Parent Teachers Association.

All of those services that are provided for people through education are not going to be as good if we don't continue through educational research to study and figure out ways to make things better. Although not a glamorous or dramatic activity, educational research as a Federal investment in the improvement of education has had bipartison support and merits consideration for adequate funding. I urge you to fund educational research at a level that will allow us to continue to find the ways to improve the quality of Education, thereby improving the quality of life for people in America.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mrs. McDonald.

Richard Anderson, director of the Center for the Study of Reading.

Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. ERDAHL. I don't mean to cut off Mr. Anderson, but I am going to have to leave, my schedule says, to take a picture with 15 Future Farmers, and probably future voters.

Mr. MURPHY. From your district, I am sure, and that is very important.

Mr. ERDAHL. I would like to make an observation. I will try to get back.

As we talked about these figures before us. The present budget, Dr. Goldberg, I believe you said is $65.6 million, the administration proposal is about $61 million, the Senate figure is $59 million, the House majority position is $25 million.

I think you should find some consolation, and I hope that we will eventually have some support, in that the minority proposal in which I participated was $62.6 million.

Where we don't often wish to acquiesce to the other body, I hope in this case, in the conference committee, that my colleagues will consider that worthy option.

Mr. GOLDBERG. We really appreciate that.

Mr. SIMON. These big spending Republicans. [General laughter.]

Mr. ERDAHL. I feel safer with the Future Farmers.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Anderson, if you will proceed.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD C. ANDERSON, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA CHAMPAIGN

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Richard Anderson. I am the director of the Center for the Study of Reading at the University of Illinois. I have been for many years a professor of education at the university. Before that, I was an assistant superintendent of schools and a classroom teacher.

What I want to do this morning is present a single concrete example of the sort of research that is being funded by the National Institute of Education.

We at the Center for the Study of Reading are in the midst of a major overhaul of the criteria for grading the readability of school textbooks. Our research reveals that current criteria that have been in use now for 20 or 30 years, place undue emphasis on easy words and short, simple sentences. A frequent result is lifeless prose, particularly for beginning readers.

Sometimes the result is laughable. There is the case of the classic children's story, "The Elves and the Shoemaker," written with a very restricted vocabulary that does not include the word elf, or the word shoe, or the word shoemaker. There is a trivial sense in which the story is easier to read, but the problem is, the child is no longer reading a story.

A general problem with current criteria for grading readability is briefness of reference. You have to use short, simple, easy, frequent words like "this," "that," and "the." The problem is the student does not know what these words are referring to.

In an effort to shorten sentences, explicit connectives like "after," "for," "because," "although," are removed. So it makes it much more difficult for the student to understand the time sequence, to understand cause and effect relationships, to understand the signals that an author in a reasonable text would place there to let you know which are the important points and which are the less important.

Recent research reveals that the critical components of this course for children are interestingness, coherence and organization. These qualities are often sacrificed under the aegis of current criteria for grading readability.

We have already presented our preliminary findings to the publishing company executives of most of the major publishing companies in this country. I must tell you that although we were sharply critical of many of their products, the response was very positive.

I fully expect that this program of research has the potential to make major improvements in the quality of schooling in this country. I submit to you that it would be a shame if this research were jeopardized by a harsh and ill-considered cut in the budget of the National Institute of Education.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Richard C. Anderson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICHARD C. ANDERSON, DIRECTOR, CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Thank you for inviting us to submit written testimony to your committee regarding the National Institute of Education (NIE). As researchers in the field of education, as teachers, and now as Director and Associate Director of NIE's Center for the Study of Reading, we have long been concerned with the Federal Government's support of eductional research.

Recently, we were distressed to learn of the action of the House Labor and Eduction Committee in cutting NIE's budget for Fiscal Year 1982 to $25 million. While we acknowledge the need for fiscal restraint in the budget and are aware of some valid criticisms of NIE's work, we feel certain that a 2/3 cut of NIE's budget would not be in the best interests of the Nation.

NIE'S BUDGET

If there ever were any agency deserving bipartisan support, that agency is the National Institute of Education. According to the Heritage Foundation report, Mandate for Leadership (p. 164):

"There are three types of educational activity in which a more active federal role is desirable. They have been eclipsed in recent years by the government's increasing involvement in the process of grant administration, but could be revitalized to give substance to a new federal role in education. They are: (1) information gathering and dissemination; (2) consultation and technical assistance in dealing with on-site teaching problems; and (3) educational research and development. These were the traditional duties of the old U.S. Office of Education. They have been neglected in recent years, despite the initiatives of the National Institute of Education, and in the past they were seldom performed with great distinction or impact. Yet there is a

tremendous need for these kinds of services to education, and there is the potential for doing them effectively."

It is regretable that funding for NIE has not been commensurate with a policy that "a more active federal role is desirable" to serve the "tremendous need" of education. The NIE has commitments based on a 1979 appropriation of $83 million. But, in 1980 NIE received only $74 million. The 1981 figure will probably be even lower. Finally, the Fiscal Year 1982 budget figure authorized by the House Labor and Education Committee is only $25 million. This is clearly inadequate. During a period of unparalleled inflation, NIE has already suffered very substantial cuts since 1979. As we shall demonstrate below, NIE has contributed greatly to the improvement of education in America. Its ability to continue this activity would be severely impaired by the proposed cuts.

VALID CRITICISM OF NIE

Although the NIE budget is generally a single line item in the Federal budget, certain privileged programs have in the past been able to obtain legislatively mandated funding floors. Particularly in a time of reduced budgets, this practice must change. The problem is not that the programs given special attention are undeserving, but rather that the effect is to take support away from other programs that may frequently be even more worthwhile. The general principle of supporting research projects solely on the basis of open competition and critical review by researchers and practitioners is adhered to by most other Federal agencies, and is certainly to be preferred for NIE. Only in this way can the agency be properly responsive to the ideas and proposals of a richly varied and diverse nationwide community of educational researchers.

VALUE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Notwithstanding certain problems of the sort discussed above, NIE has consistently sponsored high quality research that has led to numerous practical benefits for the Nation's schools. What follows is a brief description of a few results. We would be pleased to elaborate on any of these or to furnish further examples.

(1) Analyses of children's reading materials: Recent research on the texts that children read has begun to delineate the principles by which texts are organized so that they may be comprehensible and interesting to children. For the first time, researchers have been able to point precisely to aspects of narratives and expositions that make them more or less accessible to children. Such knowledge is proving invaluable in designing texts for children that are challenging and interesting to read, while taking into account their limitations as readers. Moreover, much of this knowledge can be imparted directly to the children themselves, thus enabling them to learn more quickly.

The results of this work on text analysis have not remained in the "ivory tower" of research, but are being disseminated throughout the Nation. One example of this was a recent conference organized by NIE's Center for the Study of Reading at which researchers spoke directly to representatives of virtually all the major publishers of school texts. This conference generated a strong and positive response from the publishers. Among the many responses received was the following:

I consider the Tarrytown seminar a very important event in the history of American education. At last a group of well-informed research-based highly respected scholars were able to make formal presentations from many important points of view to the major textbook publishers.

The publishers' conference is but one example of a new dialogue between researchers and those groups which directly influence American education.

(2) Thinking skills: It has long been known that one advantage that good problem solvers have over less skilled ones is that they possess more knowledge pertinent to the problem at hand. Recent research has shown that another component of problem-solving skill is the ready availability of specific strategies for working on problems. Such strategies include self-monitoring and error detection—for example, checking for contradictory assumptions and checking to see if intermediate results are plausible. Recent NIE-sponsored research in this area has deepened our understanding of thinking, problem solving, and reasoning, all essential skills for survival in a complex society. This deeper understanding is a worthy attainment in and of itself, but something more notable has also been achieved: There are now proven methods for teaching children directly to improve their thinking and learning skills. This work has had dramatic results with learning disabled and with normal children and in areas as diverse as mathematics, reading comprehension and spatial reasoning.

(3) Computers and other new technology in education: New technology—television, interactive computers, communication satellites, computer networks, and so on—has already altered our work and social lives and has begun to change schools as well. The changes are difficult to predict, and more difficult still to control, yet their magnitude demands our attention and concern. Used properly, the new technology can help to reach learners who might otherwise miss out on educational opportunities; used improperly, new technologies may exacerbate old problems, becoming at best trivial, and at worst dehumanizing.

Research supported by NIE has begun to define the conditions under which new technology will benefit children in school. Moreover, research is being carried out to develop curricula that will use new technologies in their most educationally effective and cost-effective ways.

(4) Underlying bases for learning problems: Many subjects that children are taught in school, such as arithmetic and certain aspects of physics, can now be analyzed in such a way that we can predict the kinds of errors children may make. Stated another way, we can now begin to diagnose patterns of errors that otherwise might have been considered to be random or careless. Teachers can then use the results of these analyses to go directly to the central conceptual source of a child's difficulties. This enable the teacher to help students more effectively and to teach in such a way that problems are less likely to arise.

SUMMARY

NIE must undoubtedly shoulder its share of the burden implicit in the decision to reduce Federal spending for education. Furthermore, some restructuring of its efforts in the direction of more competitively funded research would be desirable. On the other hand, the money spent for educational research is already small, proportionately less than that spent for defense, agriculture, health, or any other major endeavors. It is also small relative to what it returns. The research that led to breakthroughs of the sort described above was painstaking and long, but the value to schools and society will be repaid many times over. It would be tragic to eliminate or severely curtail the research and risk losing years of accumulated momentum.

We strongly urge the Committee to support enlarging the Nation's commitment to NIE.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. Anderson.

Before we get into the final questions, I do want you to know that the majority members of the Education and Labor Committee, of which Mr. Simon and I are members, established early this year that we would like to have kept all educational and all jurisdictional matters in our committee funded not only at last year's rate, but at an 8 percent higher rate. We established that early this year, and we would have liked to have increased this budget by 8 percent over last year's funding.

Unfortunately, the majority of the members of the House foisted upon us the Gramm-Latta budget resolution, which then commanded us to bring our total funding in the scope of our committee to some $12 billion less than last year's funding. We have had some agonizing days and nights in attempting to meet those levels.

I would say with some confidence that when we approach the conference committee that the majority members, and we hope all of the members of our committee who are serving in that conference, and I am sure we can count on Mr. Erdahl, will attempt to take the higher of the two levels, whichever came out, in the House and Senate versions of the budget.

I can state that I will be very happy to recede from the House position and adopt the Senate, if the levels are higher.

I would like to ask Dr. Goldberg, to explain what your situation will be, what the cutbacks will be, and how you will do at the Senate level funding of $59 million, which is of course the higher of the two at this point.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Thank you very much, and let me tell you, Mr. Murphy, that we really appreciate those last comments. They are very important to us and the communities we serve.

At the Senate level, we will have to make some cutback. We will probably have to reduce some efforts in some areas, and take a look at some areas which may not be producing productive information or results for people in the field. But in the main, we will be able to sustain the general thrust in the three major areas of teaching and learning, dissemination, and the improvement of practice, and educational organization and management.

The major areas that I indicated before about cutting, the clearinghouses, the national assessment program, and similar programs, would be sustained at the levels that they have this year.

We have already, at the $65 million level this year, made the necessary plans to be able to adjust to a budget of approximately $60 million next year.

Mr. MURPHY. Do you favor us removing the set-aside for the existing labs and centers?

Mr. GOLDBERG. It has been our policy, or our position for years, Mr. Murphy, that wherever possible we ought to compete in open competition as much as we can. I must say, however, that many of the institutions that we are serving now, including the center that Dr. Anderson heads up, those institutions are providing just terribly important services to the people of this country.

Again, our basic principle is an interest in open competition.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Simon.

Mr. SIMON. Yes. First of all, I want to join in commending the chairman for his comments on shifting, when we get into conference, to the higher figure. I will certainly join him in that position.

I am interested, Dr. Goldberg, you have received a mandate to get into foreign language and international studies. What is happening in that area?

Mr. GOLDBERG. Thank you very much, Mr. Simon, for bringing that up.

Just recently, we have completed the commissioning of a dozen or so papers on the issue. In fact, we presented a report to Dr. McDonald and the NCER, the national council, at their last meeting. Those papers are now being read by members of the council. They have been written by members of the international education community, if you will, who are very interested in the subject, I know you are. The National Council will be making recommendations to the Institute about how to proceed based on those recommendations.

It is our hope that the budget will permit us to move more into this area than we ever have. It is my personal belief that it is a crucial area that we have paid precious little attention to in the past.

Mr. SIMON. Needless to say, I do not disagree with that conclusion.

In your statement you say, "We support with multiyear awards 39 separate institutions." What is the geographic spread?

I am pleased to see one from Illinois here, so I am not complaining in a provincial way that Illinois is not receiving funds, but do we have a pretty good geographical dispersal; are we too much, as

you reflect on it, concentrated in Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and the University of California, or Stanford?

Mr. GOLDBERG. As a matter of fact, of those five, only one has any major award from NIE.

Mr. SIMON. The other four are in the audience. [General laughter.]

Mr. GOLDBERG. Let me say first, Mr. Simon, that we fund about 10 percent of the proposals we receive, and the number of proposals that we are receiving each year is increasing. I believe that it is increasing because of the folks that were referred to in the testimony here this morning.

Practitioners, researchers, people who are both researchers and practitioners, members of State educational agencies, local school systems, are submitting proposals at levels that they never have before to NIE. I believe they are doing that because they believe in the Institute, and they believe in educational research research and its potential for improving American education.

The 39 institutions you refer to are dispersed throughout the country. I must say that one of the requirements that NIE has for those Institutions is that every one of them have governing or advisory boards that represent the spectrum of people who are affected by the work to be done by the organization.

So, while an institution may be focusing on one area of research or another, or serving one region or another, the number of people who actually work to determine the agenda of work for that institution, and determine the effectiveness of the work of that institution is far broader than the institution itself.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much.

Dr. Greene, you said you have never received a grant, yet you are the President of the American Educational Research Association, and you are obviously involved in research. Where do you get funding for your research, basically.

Ms. GREENE. I will have to explain that. Besides the unusual prestige of serving as president of the American Educational Research Association, I teach philosophy and history of education, and this constitutes research, although it is not experimental research and ordinarily can proceed without the kind of funding experimental research requires.

Mr. SIMON. The bulk of the non-Federal funding for research comes from private foundations?

Mr. GOLDBERG. Some of it comes from private foundations, part of it comes from local school districts. For example, the New York City school system has its own research and evaluation unit. Some of the large city schools do have small units like that. A number of State education agencies have research and evaluation units.

I must say that one of the things we have done at the Institute is develop very close relationships with those places, so that we don't duplicate each other's efforts, and we can leverage each other's work with limited resources.

Mr. SIMON. Just one more comment, Mr. Chairman, and I will turn this back over to you.

Dr. Minter, you mentioned issues being complex, and answers do not come cheaply. I could not agree more. One other thing in the area of research that we have to recognize is that failure is also

part of research. We have to be willing to fall on our face in some areas, otherwise we are not going to get the job done.

Mrs. McDonald, it is good to have you. My district abuts Kentucky, I am in deep southern Illinois, and it was good to hear your comments.

I would be interested in hearing from you, Dr. Minter, your reaction to the reading is fundamental program, and the basic skills thrust. How effectively are we doing that? Are there ways that we can improve that.

Mr. MINTER. Mr. Chairman, could I make a comment, please?

Mr. MURPHY. You may, sir.

Mr. MINTER. It is a comment that has been alluded to, but I don't think has been fully brought out this morning, and that is the relationship between local school districts, colleges, and universities that NIE has fostered.

We are now very heavily into a project based on the research on effective schools. It was NIE who funded this research, it was carried out by university professors, and it was through the sharing of that information by hiring one of those professors who was at one time at Michigan State, Wilbur Brookover, who has been a pioneer. Now we are implementing the results of the research.

I think Dr. Walker quoted that it takes research 50 years, or an innovation to seep down to actual practice. We don't have that kind of time in our present society. I wanted to give you, for the record, some examples of our school improvement project that has been based on this research.

We have here six or eight schools in inner-city districts in New York City, and the project has been in effect 2 years, and we have a school in which only 23.6 percent of the youngsters were reading on grade level in 1978–79, and according to our latest figures, 2 years later, 34.1 percent are reading on grade level, which is a 10 percent increase.

If we can increase the students at the lowest levels over a 2-year period by 10 percent, the techniques that have been used because of the research and based on the research hold out a great deal of hope for big city school systems.

I might point out something that the researchers here know very well. When we did this experiment in a school where most youngsters were reading at or above grade level, 67 percent of those youngsters jumped by 19 percentage points. So that we are improving education for youngsters at all levels based upon a consortium between NIE, universities and our own school districts.

Mr. MURPHY. I want to thank the panel very much. I have several questions remaining, but because of a rollcall, I am going to ask if we may submit questions to you in writing and ask for your written response, which will be made part of the record, particularly concerning handicapped educational research, dissemination of your research material, and utilizing women and minorities in a greater role in research.

I will be submitting these questions perhaps to the entire panel, and I will ask the staff to do that. Mr. Simon and I will make our rollcall.

Thank you very, very much all of you for attending.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

82-374 O—81——4

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF
ELEMENTARY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION,
East Lansing, Mich., June 22, 1981.

Hon. AUSTIN J. MURPHY,
204 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURPHY: I want to thank you and members of the Subcommittee on Select Education for inviting me to testify on priorities for N.I.E. I will be looking forward to responding to questions on issues that were raised.

After Drs. Walker, Emans, and I completed our testimony, statements were made regarding current research sponsored by N.I.E. that, we feel, verifies our statements.

Specifically, I refer to research reported underway at the Center for Study of Reading on analysis of children's reading materials and statements on the need to work with publishers (p. 3 of Dr. Anderson's testimony). I am enclosing copies of Volumes I and II of the 1978-79 Michigan Social Studies Textbook Study, one of several studies completed in this area. The Michigan social studies co-ordinator and reviewers have met and are meeting with publishers. This research is being continued. Another study was cited during the hearings which was, also, a replication of numerous other major studies. I could cite a large number of studies on analyses of texts, but I feel the enclosed volumes will suffice as an example. The Michigan Department of Education study is, of course, available through ERIC.

While some speakers who followed the panel were careful to claim classroom teaching experience, no one claimed academic preparation or experience in the field of Reading. This, too, underscores a problem cited in our testimony. (You may wish to circulate this letter and the enclosed books.)

Drs. Emans, Walker, and I represent an increasingly large population of people who are discouraged by having those without expertise in the fields they study announce their rediscoveries at taxpayers' expense. If N.I.E. is unable or unwilling to correct these problems, I would rather see the funds spent in programs, such as Title I, that help children.

Sincerely,

LOIS A. BADER, *Professor.*

Enclosures.

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY,
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
Williamsburg, Va., July 1, 1981.

Hon. AUSTIN J. MURPHY,
Subcommittee on Select Education, 617 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: I appreciated the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee on Select Education on June 18, 1981. I wish to accept your invitation to provide additional written testimony.

The efforts that I have made to explore the programs and activities of NIE have led me to the conclusion that its personnel have failed to identify and communicate with the kind of educators who can best use their services. These educators are professors of curriculum and teaching methodology. Their programs are the most responsive to, and have the greatest general impact on, the classroom practices of the most teachers in the most schools. Instead, NIE has chosen to serve two other educational groups, local practitioners and psychologists. Neither of these two groups, by training or influence, hold such a sensitive position with respect to the overall improvement of schooling for children. Practitioners are unable to study and evaluate properly research NIE produces, and at the same time perform their duties in the classroom. The evaluation and interpretation of research findings requires, for example, technical knowledge, information synthesized from a multitude of research studies, the perspective gained by knowing many points of view on education, and the ability to reconcile seeming conflicting research evidence. Psychologists hold a biased perspective due to their special interest. Thus, it is also an error for NIE to select out professors of educational psychology, from the general

pool of professors of education, as the major group to deal with the problems of learning in the classroom. Many of the problems of the classroom cannot be solved merely by applying principles from psychology. I am concerned that so much of the research conducted by NIE is under the control of educational psychologists (and other types of psychologists as well). Their academic preparation and interests are too specialized to permit them to respond effectively to the array of problems confronting classroom teachers. The purpose of this letter is to provide evidence to support my assertion that NIE is under the control of educational psychologists, and to explain why I believe that this situation is wrong for education.

In conversations with officials at NIE, and also at the testimony provided at the hearing of the Subcommittee on Select Education on June 18, the claim was made repeatedly that personnel at NIE have had a variety of professional experiences to justify their appointments. Much was made of the fact that many have been classroom teachers. Little claim was made that they have been engaged in a scholarly study of curriculum and teaching methodology, from other than a psychological point of view. Even a cursory examination of the backgrounds of NIE personnel, and those in the various laboratories and centers, reveals a predominance of psychologists and educational psychologists among their ranks.

A most telling reflection on this bias was made by one of the witnesses at the hearing on June 18. This witness was asked if she had applied for an NIE grant to support her own research. She was a well-recognized scholar in education associated with a university known for the high quality of its academic products. Her research dealt with children's learning. She, nevertheless, stated that she had not applied for an NIE grant because the agency did not fund the type of educational research in which she was engaged.

NIE has arbitrarily chosen to focus on empirical, experimental research of the kind that is most compatible with studies conducted in the field of psychology. NIE presently functions more as a national institute of psychology than of education; and classroom practices are suffering because of it.

The primary mission of teacher education as related to classroom practices is explained and taught in universities through courses in curriculum and methods. Such courses concern the transformation of appropriate subject matter from its formal organization (history, literature, chemistry, mathematics, biology, and the like) into a state commensurate with the nature of learners and the learning process. Professors of curriculum and methods use insights from subject-matter disciplines and from many behavioral sciences, not just from psychology. Too many psychologists are unfamiliar with the subject matter taught in schools. The focus of psychologists ignores the significant information contributed to education by other specialists from such areas as sociology, anthropology, and philosophy. Then, too, psychologists tend to conduct educational research with a laboratory bias. They impose laboratory controls in classroom situations to solicit only those behaviors from students that can be measured by the research techniques available to psychologists. Thus, the kind of stimulation designed by psychologists for student performance is too restricted to aid in general mental development. Ultimately, comprehensive learning is widely ignored in our classrooms. The teaching of history, for example, becomes viewed more as how to engineer the memory of a chronology of historical events than how to interpret the means by which public events influence the ways people live, earn a living, or generate inventions. The latter perspective is more in keeping with the developmental nature of children and with the impact that history will have on their lives. Similarly, issues of discipline under the guidance of psychologists become disassociated from problems of subject-matter learning and are viewed only as problems of obedience to be managed by incentives such as rewards and punishments. Thus, disruptive behavior is not usually seen as an outcome of inadequate curriculum to be avoided by adjusting subject matter for the immature mind.

Of course, psychologists and educational psychologists should have an important part in the research that NIE conducts, but not to the point of excluding other specialists, and most certainly those in curriculum and methodology. Evidence that professors of curriculum and methods are being ignored by NIE is that few such professors appear on its personnel rosters. Similarly, studies that have proven useful to professors of curriculum and teaching methodology are often not cited in comparable, and even replicated, studies produced by NIE, e.g., studies by Barbara Stoodt on conjunctions, Ruth Strang on reading patterns, and Helen K. Smith on comprehension. Since research findings should be cumulative, adequate scholarship requires that prior research from many sources be documented before new projects are undertaken. Similarly, problems with practical, as well as conceptual, significance should be a source for new areas of study in educational research. Too frequently, NIE researchers develop new areas for investigation from the findings of

studies by their fellow psychologists that are conceptually appealing to them, but do not serve the needs of classroom teachers.

NIE has great potential for improving the schools of this nation and, thus, the education of its citizens. It has made progress in this direction. With further refinement in the understanding of its mission and in the selection of its personnel, it can function even more productively in the future.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT EMANS, *Associate Dean.*

CENTRAL GREENE SCHOOL DISTRICT,
SERVING CENTRAL GREENE COUNTY,
Waynesburg, Pa., June 17, 1981.

JUDY WAGNER,
Select Education Subcommittee, House Education and Labor Committee, 617 House Office Building Annex I, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MS. WAGNER: First of all let me again thank you for the hospitality shown us in the Select Education Subcommittee Office on Monday, June 15, 1981. It was indeed a pleasure to be able to speak to Mr. Murphy on behalf of educational research during these trying times.

I want to recap as testimony what I stated to Mr. Murphy.

Dr. John Hopkins from Research for Better Schools, Philadelphia, Pa. and Dr. Audrey Champagne from Learning Research and Development Center, Pittsburgh, Pa. accompanied me to Washington, D.C. to express my concern for the major blows, to put it bluntly, that research in education is experiencing. We were accompanied by David Florio who has the same concerns that we do.

Research in education should be the backbone and the base for what occurs in the confines of the classroom. If that's not happening, it should be a number one priority of all administrators. We cannot and must not continue to do what we want to do or what we think feels right to do in the classroom. In 1973 I very well remember being asked by a superintendent why I chose to do a specific organizational plan with a group of students. When I tried to explain, I soon discovered that all the research and base data indicated that what I was about to do was not a sound educational practice, a lesson I never forgot. The Central Greene School District has utilized the services of Research for Better Schools programs such as Pennsylvania School Improvement Plan and Time on Task and Learning Research and Development Center programs such as the early work of Jerome Rosner in Learning Disabilities and research compilations by Doris Gow. We intend to use also their work in the area of science. Far West Laboratories continuously ask our teachers in Central Greene to try their products and respond.

Intermediate Unit I is most always instrumental in delivering these services to the twenty-five school districts in Greene, Fayette and Washington Counties. Superintendents are made aware of these possible programs at their yearly planning sessions if applicable. The Intermediate Unit I Curriculum Council of which I am a member yearly reviews these possibles. If interest is generated we then offer an awareness session at the Intermediate Unit and all twenty-five school districts are invited to attend and take advantage of any program that might be appropriate.

Central Greene's East Franklin Elementary School (teachers 29/students 535) during the 1979–80 school term upgraded the reading program by implementation of the Pennsylvania School Improvement Plan.

In April, two teachers from East Ward Elementary School (teachers 9/students 235) and myself were trained in the process of Student Time on Task, a process to enhance learning of math and reading.

We plan to offer this workshop or in-service to all the teachers in the Central Greene School District, opening it also to the other four districts in Greene County, during October, 1981. One of the developers from Research for Better Schools has consented to act as a consultant.

Again, I write this testimony to let you know that a research base is and should be an integral part of our educational system in Greene County, expecially southwestern Pennsylvania where the area is rural, the environment rugged and the need is greatest.

Sincerely,

NANCY I. DAVIS,
Director of Curriculum/Instruction.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO,
June 18, 1981.

Hon. AUSTIN J. MURPHY,
Chairman, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Select Education, 617 House Office Building Annex No. 1, Washington, D.C.

Since I have been asked to submit written testimony concerning the hearing on the National Institute on Education I would like to make some of my views known. They are as follows:

1. A great deal of money has been spent and wasted by the NIE over the past years.
2. Many of the staff researching children have never taught themselves. This should not be allowed.
3. Grants should be smaller and the qualifications for each grant should be more strict, especially regarding the people who administer and use the grant for research.

Thank you for the opportunity to let me express my opinion.

Sincerely yours,

ELDON E. EKWALL, *Professor of Education.*

NEWARK, DEL., *June 17, 1981.*

Hon. AUSTIN J. MURPHY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Select Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The International Reading Association is a 65,000 member professional organization dedicated to the improvement of reading and reading education. As a professional association, we are an open forum for ideas and discussion. Furthermore, the association has many committees and special interest groups which provide for that debate and discussion. Yet, even with this diversity the association does take stands.

One of our positions is to be supportive of the National Institute of Education (NIE). We disseminate the Institute's findings in our three professional journals: The Reading Teacher, the Journal of Reading and the Reading Research Quarterly. Also, we have co-published monographs with NIE.

Collectively, we have found that the work of NIE is essential to the understanding of the teaching of reading. We therefore hope that you will continue to work with us to support NIE so that our work to improve education can work forward.

However, the twenty-five million dollar funding level is below what is needed to meet the demands of the educational community for an effective research component.

We will be providing written testimony for your consideration next week before the record is closed.

Sincerely,

RALPH STAIGER, *Executive Director.*

INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION,
Newark, Del., June 24, 1981.

Hon. AUSTIN J. MURPHY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Select Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As I indicated last week, the International Reading Association is pleased to submit written testimony in favor of continued support for the National Institute of Education.

Two copies of this testimony are enclosed herewith, together with attachments.

Very sincerely yours,

RALPH C. STAIGER, *Executive Director.*

Enclosures.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

WRITTEN TESTIMONY, INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION

The International Reading Association (IRA) is a nonprofit professional organization dedicated to the promotion of literacy throughout the world. Specifically, the Association seeks to improve the quality of reading instruction through the study of

the reading process and teaching techniques, to promote the development of every person's reading proficiency to the highest possible level, and to further an awareness among all people of the impact of reading and the formation of the lifetime reading habit.

Over 1,100 councils and national affiliates in 26 nations are the working foundation of the Association. However, the 65,000 IRA members are from 80 different countries. These members include classroom teachers, reading specialists, consultants, administrators, supervisors, college teachers, researchers, psychologists, librarians, and parents. As a large umbrella organization, the Association includes members with many interests and abilities, as well as members with divergent views.

The Association's interests in research is intrinsic; it spends much of its effort in the dissemination of ideas related to reading which are rooted in evidence. It is not only concerned with research in reading, for there is much in the entire corpus of educational research which impinges upon reading. For example, basic research on intelligence, on curriculum, and memory have application in reading. This testimony will be limited to the research in reading, however.

THE NEED

We believe that basic research in reading is of great importance to our country. New technology has opened doors for teaching and learning which are dependent upon greater knowledge of the processes of reading than is currently available; specific information on motivations for reading is sparse; only the beginnings of solid research on comprehension in reading have been made by the Center for the Study of Reading. There is still much to be learned about man's use of the written word.

The coordination of the results of this new knowledge is also a function of the National Institute of Education, so that duplication of effort can be avoided, as well as research information made known to the field. In addition, open competition from the field is also essential to the health of the educational research effort. We should not limit education research to only a few institutions, laboratories or centers, and, when prolonged funding is provided for an institution, monitoring progress is essential.

NIE-sponsored research has been reported in professional research journals, carried to teachers through professional and popular journals, newsletters, conference presentations and discussions at small seminars and large conventions. At our own annual convention, which involved 11,800 persons in early May, 1981, an entire segment on research was well-attended. Much of the work discussed and reported was related to that of the National Institute of Education. In addition, attendance at the Association's world congresses (1,000 biennially), regional meetings (14,000 annually), state conferences (50, varying from 5,000 to 300 each) provide research information to the conferees. Some of IRA's overseas affiliates which have national meetings are hungry for research reports. A regional meeting in Joensuu, Finland, August 1981, sponsored by our European reading associations, will serve as a dissemination vehicle of considerable merit.

IRA members draw on research sponsored by NIE for fundamental knowledge of reading processes, teaching strategies, measurement systems, improvement in teacher education, and new perspectives on the effectiveness of schools. Documentation is available that NIE-supported research influences the field of reading by:

persuading major publishers to incorporate research findings from the Center for the Study of Reading in their textbooks and curricular materials which are used by 98 percent of the elementary school children in the country;

focusing attention on comprehension (see Attachment 1);

sparking new approaches to writing clear documents, such as tax forms (see Attachment 2);

sustaining basic research on learning to read (see Attachment 3);

informing the public about increases in reading achievement from the National Assessment of Educational Progress;

substantiating recommendations to parents about fostering the reading of their children (see Attachment 4); and

illuminating the political and occupational demands on reading in a technological age (see Attachment 5).

THE SUPPORT

The funds available for the National Institute of Education have always been pitifully meager, considering the importance of its mission. A private industry which spent only 0.03 percent of its annual budget on research and development

would soon fail. Hewlett Packard, for example, allots 10 percent of its budget for research, according to its annual report.

Continuity of educational research through programmatic efforts is essential to the future of education in our country. This is not to suggest that evaluation of current undertakings, and recasting programs which are not progressing satisfactorily, should not take place.

Emasculating the NIE budget to the $25 million level would be a disservice which will be paid for by future generations, for basic research is a prerequisite to the many improvements which are being made possible in our fast-changing technological society.

RESEARCH VIEWS—THE 1970's COMPREHENSION RESEARCH

(By John T. Guthrie)

During the 1970s, the scope of research on reading broadened. It now requires a larger definition to encompass studies that are designed to be about reading. A wider array of investigators seek to illuminate the many phenomena that characterize this human ability in its proficient stage and in its acquisition.

There have always been investigators who use reading as a medium. Studies are often conducted on visual perception, language comprehension, persuasion, or consumerism, in which reading effectively serves as a tool. Although much can be learned about reading from this latter kind of research, the information is often inaccessible or buried through underinterpretation. It is the former collection—studies on reading itself—that has broadened in definition and increased in number during the past decade.

To illustrate the research on reading that was prominent in the beginning of the 1970s, the annual summary of reading published in the *Reading Research Quarterly* (Winter 1970) may be used. In that issue, 416 reports of reading research were compiled under William S. Gray's classic categories of the sociology, physiology, psychology, and teaching of reading. Within the psychology of reading, a preponderance of studies were on cognitive processes, although studies of language, personality, and sex differences made a nominal showing. The majority of papers on cognitive processes was focused on visual perception, auditory processes, and visual-auditory integration. The word, as opposed to the phrase, the paragraph, or the story, was used as the unit of analysis. Characteristics of words, such as their frequency of occurrence in written materials or the concreteness of nouns, were analyzed, and paired associate learing was a favorite paradigm for studying their ease of acquisition. Research on these cognitive variables comprised 64 percent of the research on the psychology of reading. The only foreshadow of research to come in the 70s was the work of Lawrence Frase on questions and memory for text, which was published mostly in the *Journal of Educational Psychology* and regarded at the time as intriguing but somehow beyond the pale of reading.

Also in 1970 the teaching of reading attracted the attention of educational researchers. Although a few fruitless statements about the status of reading instruction were being made (e.g., how many remedial reading teachers are located in certain districts of a state) and some forays into reading readiness were made, the bulk of the investigations pertained to methods of instruction. Of 25 studies on the teaching of reading, comparisons of allegedly different methods represent 80 percent of the group. This was the era of contrasting of initial teaching alphabet (ita) with conventional instruction, of visual perceptual training compared to no control, and basal instruction versus basal plus phonics. What typified these studies was the comparison of one or more series of tasks that were given to children to facilitate the acquisitor of word recognition or reading comprehension ability. The experiments consisted of altering cognitive tasks or their sequences to examine the effect on reading achievement. Although a study by Labov on the relationship between reading achievement and school-related values of Black adolescents was included in the annual summary of 1970, this article was regarded as a contribution to sociology, rather than to our understanding of reading.

NEW DIRECTIONS

Now, in 1980, the focus of reading research has shifted. The cognitive processes in reading under active investigation were expanded to include the comprehension of story structures, integration of sentences, drawing inferences, testing hypotheses, relating background knowledge to textual information, and reading as a process of information search. This expansion is represented in the studies of Richard Anderson, Gordon Bower, Walter Kintsch, Jean Mandler, Bonnie Meyer, David Rumelhart, Nancy Stein and Tom Trabasso. To accommodate this veritable explosion,

several journals were founded including *Cognitive Psychology* (1970), *Discourse Processes* (1978), and *Cognitive Science* (1975).

Yet these researchers and journals are not highly visible to professional reading educators. Indeed, many of the researchers are unknown to the indigenous members and even the leaders in the field of reading. However, they are with us because in psychology it has become fashionable to study reading comprehension.

We may witness this trend by observing the "coming out" of Walter Kintsch. He is a highly regarded psychologist from the University of Colorado, known for his book *The Representation of Meaning in Memory*. As a major invited speaker at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting (April 1979), he gave an address titled, "On Modeling Comprehension." An article based on this presentation was published in the *Educational Psychologist* (Vol. 14, 1979), a publication of the American Psychological Association. This leading psychologist has addressed two prominent research organizations on, in his words, "text comprehension" and "global, gist-producing marcroprocesses" that "promote a more sophisticated understanding of the comprehension processes and problems in reading.

CENTER FOR READING

During the decade of the 70s, institutional history, too, was made in the U.S. A research center devoted entirely to reading was established by the National Institute of Education, and its focus was intended to be comprehension in the middle grades. The center owes its existence to at least three factors. One of them was a widespread weariness with the study of decoding and a concurrence, rightly or wrongly, that progress in the teaching of beginning reading depended upon applying available knowledge rather than constructing new information. A second factor was a bold psychologist from Stanford, Carl Frederickson, who was central in developing NIE's request for proposals that gave structure and direction to this research center. The third agent was Richard C. Anderson of the University of Illinois, who spearheaded the winning proposal. His success derives from having some of the more imaginative, productive, and rigorous cognitive scientists from linguistics, psychology, artificial intelligence, and education orient their research at least occasionally in a similar direction.

Prior to the funding of the Center for the Study of Reading, the last major concentrated federal investment in research on reading had produced the infamous cooperative first-grade studies. Reported in *Reading Research Quarterly* in 1967 by Bond and Dykstra, this is the most widely known study in reading. It consisted of comparisons among six different approaches to teaching reading, conducted in 27 first-grade reading projects throughout the U.S. Generally, researchers believe that the study produced no conclusions. It is often regarded as having yielded neither tentative findings that might be verified nor provocative suggestions for the future. The data analysis has been criticized and the inferences from it are doubted by many. The study failed to give prescriptions for what programs to install in what locations. Neither did it improve our understanding about the process of reading or the characteristics of effective teaching.

The upshot of this frustrating experiment is a new perspective on the scientific basis for reading education. It leads us to recognize that comparative studies of reading programs will not yield a knowledge base for increasing children's reading achievement. What we now suspect is that a reading method is not an isolable, transportable, reproducible that can be prescribed, consumed, removed, and contrasted with others along clearly defined dimensions.

Researchers' hopes have shifted away from the testing of programs toward the development of principles. The holy grail of cognitive psychologists is understanding how people read, charting the course of how children learn reading, and building theories for how teachers can improve reading ability in students. If these problems seem familiar and important to professionals in reading, we can celebrate the fact that we have been joined by actors of another ilk. Although more minds tuned to the same problem rise more opportunities for confusion, they also raise the probabilities of progress.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN,
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING,
Champaign, Ill., June 16, 1981.

Hon. AUSTIN J. MURPHY,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: Thank you for inviting us to submit written testimony to your committee regarding the National Institute of Education (NIE). As researchers in the field of education, as teachers, and now as Director and Associate Director of

NIE's Center for the Study of Reading, we have long been concerned with the Federal Government's support of educational research.

Recently, we were distressed to learn of the action of the House Labor and Education Committee in cutting NIE's budget for Fiscal Year 1982 to $25 million. While we acknowledge the need for fiscal restraint in the budget and are aware of some valid criticisms of NIE's work, we feel certain that a ⅔ cut of NIE's budget would not be in the best interests of the Nation.

NIE'S BUDGET

If there ever were an agency deserving bipartisan support, that agency is the National Institute of Education. According to the Heritage Foundation report, Mandate for Leadership (p. 164):

"There are three types of educational activity in which a more active federal role is desirable. They have been eclipsed in recent years by the government's increasing involvement in the process of grant administration, but could be revitalized to give substance to a new federal role in education. They are: (1) information gathering and dissemination; (2) consultation and technical assistance in dealing with on-site teaching problems; and (3) educational research and development. These were the traditional duties of the old U.S. Office of Education. They have been neglected in recent years, despite the initiatives of the National Institute of Education, and in the past they were seldom perfomed with great distinction or impact. Yet there is a tremendous need for these kinds of services to education, and there is the potential for doing them effectively."

It is regretable that funding for NIE has not been commensurate with a policy that "a more active federal role is desirable" to serve the "tremendous need" of education. The NIE has commitments based on a 1979 appropriation of $83 million. But, in 1980 NIE received only $74 million. The 1981 figure will probably be even lower. Finally, the Fiscal Year 1982 budget figure authorized by the House Labor and Education Committee is only $25 million. This is clearly inadequate. During a period of unparalleled inflation, NIE has already suffered very substantial cuts since 1979. As we shall demonstrate below, NIE has contributed greatly to the improvement of education in America. Its ability to continue this activity would be severely impaired by the proposed cuts.

VALID CRITICISM OF NIE

Although the NIE budget is generally a single line item in the Federal budget, certain privileged programs have in the past been able to obtain legislatively mandated funding floors. Particularly in a time of reduced budgets, this practice must change. The problem is not that the programs given special attention are undeserving, but rather that the effect is to take support away from other programs that may frequently be even more worthwhile. The general principle of supporting research projects solely on the basis of open competition and critical review by researchers and practitioners is adhered to by most other Federal agencies, and is certainly to be preferred for NIE. Only in this way can the agency be properly responsive to the ideas and proposals of a richly varied and diverse nationwide community of educational researchers.

VALUE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Notwithstanding certain problems of the sort discussed above, NIE has consistently sponsored high quality research that has led to numerous practical benefits for the Nation's schools. What follows is a brief description of a few results. We would be pleased to elaborate on any of these or to furnish further examples.

(*1*) *Analyses of children's reading materials.*—Recent research on the texts that children read has begun to delineate the principles by which texts are organized so that they may be comprehensible and interesting to children. For the first time, researchers have been able to point precisely to aspects of narratives and expositions that make them more or less accessible to children. Such knowledge is proving invaluable in designing texts for children that are challenging and interesting to read, while taking into account their limitations as readers. Moreover, much of this knowledge can be imparted directly to the children themselves, thus enabling them to learn more quickly.

The results of this work on text analysis have not remained in the "ivory tower" of research, but are being disseminated throughout the Nation. One example of this was a recent conference organized by NIE's Center for the Study of Reading at which researchers spoke directly to representatives of virtually all the major publishers of school texts. This conference generated a strong and positive response from the publishers. Among the many responses received was the following:

I consider the Tarrytown seminar a very important event in the history of American education. At last a group of well-informed, research-based, highly respected scholars were able to make formal presentations from many important points of view to the major textbook publishers.

The publishers' conference is but one example of a new dialogue between researchers and those groups which directly influence American education.

(2) Thinking skills.—It has long been known that one advantage that good problem solvers have over less skilled ones is that they possess more knowledge pertinent to the problem at hand. Recent research has shown that another component of problem-solving skill is the ready availability of specific strategies for working on problems. Such strategies include self-monitoring and error detection—for example, checking for contradictory assumptions and checking to see if intermediate results are plausible. Recent NIE-sponsored research in this area has deepened our understanding of thinking, problem solving, and reasoning, all essential skills for survival in a complex society. This deeper understanding is a worthy attainment in and of itself, but something more notable has also been achieved: There are now proven methods for teaching children directly to improve their thinking and learning skills. This work has had dramatic results with learning disabled and with normal children and in areas as diverse as mathematics, reading comprehension and spatial reasoning.

(3) Computers and other new technology in education.—New technology—television, interactive computers, communication satellites, computer networks, and so on—has already altered our work and social lives and has begun to change schools as well. The changes are difficult to predict, and more difficult still to control, yet their magnitude demands our attention and concern. Used properly, the new technology can help to reach learners who might otherwise miss out on educational opportunities; used improperly, new technologies may exacerbate old problems, becoming at best trivial, and at worst dehumanizing.

Research supported by NIE has begun to define the conditions under which new technology will benefit children in school. Moreover, research is being carried out to develop curricula that will use new technologies in their most educationally effective and cost-effective ways.

(4) Underlying bases for learning problems.—Many subjects that children are taught in school, such as arithmetic and certain aspects of physics, can now be analyzed in such a way that we can predict the kinds of errors children may make. Stated another way, we can now begin to diagnose patterns of errors that otherwise might have been considered to be random or careless. Teachers can then use the results of these analyses to go directly to the central conceptual source of a child's difficulties. This enables the teacher to help students more effectively and to teach in such a way that problems are less likely to arise.

SUMMARY

NIE must undoubtedly shoulder its share of the burden implict in the decision to reduce Federal spending for education. Furthermore, some restructing of its efforts in the direction of more competitively funded research would be desirable. On the other hand, the money spent for educational research is already small, proportionately less than that spent for defense, agriculture, health, or any other major endeavors. It is also small relative to what it returns. The research that led to breakthroughs of the sort described above was painstaking and long, but the value to schools and society will be repaid many times over. It would be tragic to eliminate or severely curtail the research and risk losing years of accumulated momentum.

We strongly urge the Committee to support enlarging the Nation's commitment to NIE.

Sincerely,

BERTRAM BRUCE,
Associate Director, Center for the Study of Reading.
RICHARD C. ANDERSON,
Director, Center for the Study of Reading.

COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1981.

JUDY WAGNER,
House Subcommittee on Select Education, 617 House Annex I, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JUDY, A former president of NEA, Dr. Lyman Ginger of Lexington, Kentucky delivered testimony on behalf of the Council for Educational Development and Research before the House Appropriation Subcommittee. Dr. Ginger made an excellent case for practical school-based educational research, development, dissemination and technical assistance which the CEDAR-member institutions provide.

I am sending you a copy of our testimony for your information. An explanation of labs and centers procurement process is on pages 5–7.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY WALSH.

Enclosure.

STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

IN SUPPORT OF THE

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION'S
FY 82 BUDGET REQUEST

PRESENTED BEFORE THE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROPRIATION SUBCOMMITTEE
ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION
AND RELATED AGENCIES

JUNE 23, 1981

BY
LYMAN V. GINGER
LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

Biographical Sketch

Lyman V. Ginger

Birthplace and Date: Ballard County, Kentucky
June 21, 1907

Education: Doctor of Education
University of Kentucky

Master of Arts
University of Kentucky

Bachelor of Arts
Kentucky Wesleyan College

Experience: Teacher Winchester High School
Principal, Owingsville Consolidated School
Teacher and Principal, University School, Lexington
Director, Elementary and Secondary Student Teaching Program,
University of Kentucky
Dean, College of Adult and Extension Education,
University of Kentucky
Associate Dean, Teacher Education and Certification,
University of Kentucky
Kentucky Superintendent of Public Instruction
Kentucky Secretary to the Education and Arts Cabinet
Executive Director, Kentucky State Commission
for Post-secondary Education

Honorary and Civic Memberships:

Former President, Kentucky Education Association
Former President, National Education Association
Former board member, Appalachia Educational Laboratory,
Charleston, West Virginia
Board member, CEMREL regional laboratory, St. Louis, Mo.
Delegate, International Conference on Education
United Nations Delegate to the World Organizations of the
Teaching Professions
Delegate, Education Commission of the United States National
Commission for UNESCO

Federal Support, Local Control: A Case for NIE Funding

The Council for Educational Development and Research (CEDaR) is pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the House Appropriation Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies. We appreciate Chairman Natcher's willingness to hold these public hearings, particularly during this time of uncertainty about the future of federal support for educational programs.

Our comments today concern the Administration's FY 82 appropriation request for the National Institute of Education. The Administration has requested $61 million for its educational research agency. This level reflects a budget cut of 12 percent from the FY 81 request and a reduction of $4.6 million below the currently appropriated level.

The Administration figure, although low, now appears to be higher than the current congressional reconciliation process will allow for FY 82. That is, the U.S. Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee has recommended a funding ceiling of $59 million. The House Education and Labor Committee, on the other hand, has recommended only $25 million. Consequently, any compromise between the two chambers will still produce a lower ceiling for NIE than the Administration's current funding request.

At this point, then, all we can do is urge the House Appropriation Committee to

accept the highest funding mark possible for the Institute. Even at the ceiling authorized by the Congress, the National Institute of Education will receive a severe reduction in funding, undoubtedly far below the figure requested by the Administration.

Certainly it's logical for those of us within the research community to argue that this committee should easily accept what seems to us to be a significantly reduced budget request for NIE. But we also realize that other, equally deserving colleagues are making a similiar assertion for their programs. And we appreciate the task this committee faces in sorting through competing claims and enthusiastic endorsements for those programs and agencies most deserving of the limited federal education dollar.

We don't envy the committee's task. We only wish, as does this committee, that sufficient resources were available to fund all the deserving programs. Because funds are tight and because this committee has tough decisions to make, we will attempt in the remainder of our testimony to provide some justification for the programs NIE supports within our institutions. Others will argue elegantly, we believe, for the remainder of NIE's budget request. And we wish to support their arguments and add our endorsement to their cause. The nation's schools certainly need all the research and development talent NIE can support at the highest level possible.

Labs, Centers Conduct Practical R & D

Before we go any further, we should explain to the Committee our vested

interest. The Council for Educational Development and Research has as its charter members the regional educational laboratories and the university-based educational research and development centers. Together, these 17 labs and centers have negotiated contracts and grants with NIE totaling roughly $32 million.

The labs and centers do the kind of work the Administration supports. That is, the labs and centers do applied research and development. The results are designed to have an impact on student achievement.

All too often congressional committees form the impression that educational research is a pie-in-the-sky, esoteric exercise that produces inch-thick reports and little else. That's not true at the laboratories and centers. They conduct practical, school-focused research and development and carry out a set of activities designed to ensure the practical application of their work.

Two Ways To Identify an R & D Agenda

Ironically, in an Administration that endorses local decision-making, the educational research agenda in this country remains very much a Washington, D.C. product. The National Institute of Education controls the research agenda through its procurement procedures. The agency's employees write a scope of work, determine the research to be conducted, identify the service to be rendered, and the audiences to be reached, all through the competitive RFP (request for proposal) process. This process is hailed because of its "competitive" nature. And because competition is an American concept as old as federal procurement itself,

scant attention is given the real issue: who controls the agenda. Obviously, the federal agency that writes the RFP and stages the competition exercises all the control. When the government is purchasing office desks or ordering airplane landing gear, competitive procurement works. When the government is attempting to improve education the process leaves much to be desired.

Several years ago the U.S. Congress recognized that it wasn't particularly enamored with NIE nor its choice of research priorities. Consequently, the Congress directed that NIE use a different procurement procedure when dealing with the labs and centers. The Congress said that local and state education agencies, working through these specialized r & d institutions, should determine their own research and development agendas.

The Congress spelled out the process in some detail 1976 (Sec. 405 of the General Education Provisions Act). In so many words, Congress told NIE to request from the eight regional laboratories and nine r & d centers five-year plans. These plans, the bill said, should be developed in consultation with NIE. But more importantly, they should reflect the needs of the laboratories' geographical regions and the centers' particular problem areas.

Congress also mandated that the Administration put together a distinguished peer review group to critique the plans as well as the institutions themselves. This congressionally-mandated Panel for the Review of Laboratory and Center Operations spent a year at its task before submitting a final report to Congress. The report said that 14 of the 17 labs and centers had submitted exemplary plans and had the institutional characteristics required by law to receive a "special institutional relationship" designation. The other three were strengthened by the

Institute the following year and then given the designation.

The relationship designation meant that NIE then solicited from the institutions three-year proposals for research, development, dissemination, and technical assistance. The Institute hired additional peer reviewers to critique these proposals and help the Institute decide on the funding level for each. Eventually, then, after additional site visits and internal as well as external reviews, NIE entered into three-year grants and contracts with the institutions. These awards extend through FY 82.

Although the lab-center contracts and grants were not technically won in a "competition," they do reflect more government oversight and review than traditional competitive awards. That is, the labs and centers received more reviews, more audits, and more public scrutiny than any set of institutions NIE funds. In addition, the labs and centers continue to receive heavy program monitoring.

The "special relationship" also entails additional monitoring. The Institute has assigned each lab and center an "institutional monitor" with the responsibility of ensuring that they continue to operate within Institute-defined parameters.

The relationship, in other words, places a heavier burden on the labs and centers than normal federal contractors receive when accepting NIE funding. But in return for the heavy monitoring, the constant interaction with federal employes, and perceived "special treatment," the labs and centers do have an opportunity to propose for federal consideration a research and development program that makes sense for local and state educators.

This federally funded and locally determined r & d approach has worked out quite well. The labs conduct a variety of needs sensing activities within the geographical regions they serve. The centers operate a little differently. Each is located at a major research university. Each has recruited the finest minds available from a wide range of academic disciplines to work as a team on a single educational problem area.

Currently the labs and centers are in the middle of their negotiated three-year awards. An appropriation of $56 million would enable NIE to honor these contractual obligations, as well as all the Institute's other contracts and grants.

We Have a Vested Interest in NIE

The labs and centers, then, have a vested interest in NIE. But so does this Committee. An r & d agency such as NIE exists for one reason only and that's to provide better answers to questions that puzzle us all.

For example, we all have a problem when kids leave school not knowing how to read or write. It's much too simple to blame the problems on the schools. But the schools nevertheless are the institutions with the responsibilitiy for educating our young people. So the question becomes, what could they have done to give these nonlearners an adequate education? The research community doesn't have the answer. Certainly not one single answer. But we certainly know a lot more today than we did say three years ago about how schools might go about reducing this problem. For example, the labs and centers have started working closely with teachers on their classroom management skills. Research coming out of the labs

and centers has shown us that children make significant increases in achievement when taught in well-managed classrooms. The task now is to work with teachers to provide them with the skills needed to better organize their instruction and thus take advantage of these research findings.

The labs and centers work closely with teachers to develop materials they find useful in their classrooms. CEMREL, the St. Louis-based laboratory, for example, asked teachers to explain to the lab's staff their most difficult problems in teaching reading or mathematics. CEMREL then compiled the best available research evidence on how to solve these problems and produced its popular Research Within Reach publications. The laboratory has distributed Research Within Reach to more than 50,000 teachers.

The labs and centers are helping teachers address some of their most pressing concerns. For example, the Center for Social Organization of Schools, located at Johns Hopkins University, has developed a Student Team Learning program. The program is designed to foster improved cooperation among students in desegregated schools and to raise achievement in the basic skills. The program is so successful that it is now in use in 3,000 schools in 1,500 school districts in every state in the nation.

R & D As an Approach

A good many people, and certainly some in the current Administration, view educational "research" as something that occurs in isolation from educational

"improvement." Frankly, a lot of people engaged in educational research argue that the activity is independent and worthy of support on its own merits. We don't make that argument. We view research as one piece of our overall school improvement thrust.

In other words, we view ourselves as educational problem-solvers. Frequently we have a solution. When we do, our task becomes one of providing school districts with the help they need to apply the solution to fit their local situation. But other times we simply don't have the answer. Frequently we'll have a hunch based on previous research. But that's often all it is, a hunch.

For example, the research community has many hunches about how to best teach kids to comprehend or understand what they read. But in all honesty, we don't know the best way of doing it. So while we help school teachers choose among the best options available, we are also conducting research to advance our own knowledge base. Hopefully, we'll be able to provide the teachers with better information next year. Eventually, then, we should be able to develop a solution to this problem as we have for other ones.

Education Needs Labs and Centers

Educational research never does well during a period of fiscal austerity. Programs that impact directly on students and schools receive first priority. And that's how it should be. Frankly, research can be delayed a year or two without major consequences. In the long run, though, education like any other venture, needs

new ideas and new knowledge.

So this Committee must decide, during this time of fiscal austerity, how it wishes to invest its scarce research dollars. We feel strongly that it should be spread as far as possible among proven institutional performers. We're talking about the labs and centers, of course. But we also mean the ERIC clearinghouses, the NIE-established and operated research centers at Illinois and Michigan State University, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress program.

During these rough times, as the federal government and the schools themselves grapple with the changes swirling about them, established, high-quality r & d institutions represent the taxpayers' best investment. They have the capability to offer a full range of research, development, dissemination, and technical assistance functions. And that's what's needed, more now than ever.

Consequently, we urge the members of this Committee to appropriate to NIE sufficient funds to enable the agency to meet its contractual commitments.

Massachusetts
HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE
CORPORATION

1010 Park Square Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02116 (617) 426-9434

JOSEPH M. CRONIN
President

EDWARD R. TUFTS
Treasurer

HELGE HOLST
Chairman

ADELINA A. CHELLA
Assistant Treasurer

JUDITH ALLEN
Vice President

MICHAEL W. RIORDAN
Vice President — Operations

June 26, 1981

DIRECTORS

*Gregory M. Adamian, *President*
Bentley College
*Judith Allen, *Assistant to the President*
Williams College
Hildreth Auer, *Chairman of the Board*
Malden Trust Company
G. Dana Bill, *President*
Malden Trust Company
George J. Brennan, Jr.
Chairman of the Board
Bay State Junior College
Forrester A. Clark
H.C. Wainwright Company
Laura R. Closson, *Chancellor*
Massachusetts Board of Higher Education
*Gerald S. Costantino,
Director of Financial Aid
Southeastern Massachusetts University
Joseph M. Cronin, *President*
MHEAC
Thomas S. Curtin, *Consultant*
Grant E. Curtis, *Director of Financial Aid*
Tufts University
Dorothy Donahue, *Assistant Vice President*
Northampton National Bank
John B. Duff, *President*
University of Lowell
George Ellison, *President*
Ellison Agency
Mary E. Fahey, *Vice President*
Springfield Institution for Savings
Frank C. Genovese, *Professor of Economics*
Babson College
Douglas A. Gherlone, *Assistant Treasurer*
Ware Savings Bank
David H. Green, *Chairman of the Board*
L.G. Balfour Company
*Helge Holst, *Chairman*
MHEAC
C. Carlton Lord, *Assistant Vice President*
Charlestown Savings Bank
Clifton R. Milne, *Loan Officer*
New England Merchants National Bank
*Edward R. Pinto, *Executive Vice President*
BayBank Norfolk County Trust Company
*Everett P. Pope, *Chairman of the Board*
Workingmens Co-operative Bank
*Kenneth R. Romano, *Senior Vice President*
The First National Bank of Boston
Donald McM. Routh, *Dean of Financial Aid*
Amherst College
Kenneth G. Ryder, *President*
Northeastern University
Frank Sawtell, *President*
Checker Taxi Company
Elaine L. Simmons, *Vice President*
Mutual Bank for Savings
Sylvia Simmons,
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Massachusetts - Boston
William H. Sullivan, *President*
Metropolitan Petroleum Company
*Edward R. Tufts, *Treasurer*
MHEAC
William M. Wadsworth, *Vice President*
Shawmut Bank of Boston, N.A.
John H. Wood, *President*
Melrose Savings Bank
Thomas S. Zanco
Executive Vice President
Provident Institution for Savings
in the Town of Boston

*denotes member of Executive Committee

The Honorable Austin J. Murphy
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Education and Labor
Subcommittee on Select Education
617 House Office Building, Annex #1
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Murphy,

As requested I enclose testimony on NIE.
Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Joseph M. Cronin
President

WRITTEN TESTIMONY

FOR THE

HOUSE SELECT SUB-COMMITTEE

ON

EDUCATION

BY JOSEPH M. CRONIN, PRESIDENT
MASSACHUSETTS HIGHER EDUCATION
ASSISTANCE CORPORATION
AND FORMER SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION,
STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to submit this written testimony concerning the National Institute of Education. I have observed the Institute since its inception in 1972. As Secretary of Educational Affairs in Massachusetts, and State Superintendent in Illinois, and now as President of the Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corporation, I have come to know well the quality and usefulness of the work of the Institute.

In recent years the NIE has experienced considerable success in sponsoring research genuinely useful to teachers, to administrators, and to policy-makers on the state and federal levels. My youngest daughter learned to read from a teacher using the SWRL (Southwest Regional Lab) materials.

NIE's work in the basic skills compiling information about how best to insure that students learn to read, write and compute is increasingly important to our nation's teachers. Research studies on how to improve teacher education, student evaluation, and the educational component of desegregation plans have begun to make a difference.

NIE's work in school finance has been especially useful. The information available from NIE helps states revise formulas to insure equity in education finance during a period of generally declining state budgets.

While NIE has traditionally focussed its attention in large part on elementary and secondary education, in recent years it has developed a small post-secondary grants program which has been outstanding.

In short, we have in NIE not an old agency set in its ways and grown wasteful over the years, but a relatively young agency, which is just now bearing the full fruit of its potential. The budget reductions envisioned for the Institute, therefore, do not represent a kind of pruning of decaying branches, but, instead, severe damage at the moment of greatest productivity.

If this productivity is to be maintained in the face of mjor budget reduction, it is important that the amount of that reduction not be so great as to

make prudent salvaging impossible. I have two suggestions about how such reductions might most effectively take place.

First, I think that the Institute should be directed to choose two or three areas for research which the Congress and educational professions consider to be of utmost importance and to focus its budget on those areas. In my opinion, an attempt to reduce activities proportionally in all areas in which the Institute does research would not be wise.

Second, I believe that the Institute should be directed to focus its remaining dollars on some of the more recently established research priorities rather than continuing to fund enterprises which it has funded for many years and which, by now, should have resources to seek financial independence.

I believe that the topics which should remain as major themes for NIE research are basic skills, school finance, and post-secondary education.

In the area of basic skills, I believe that a great deal more cooperation is necessary between those people of the Institute who are responsible for research about the basic skills and those people of the Institute whose job it is to disseminate information about research findings. A consolidation of personnel in those two areas might insure that the research project managers maintain close touch with the field.

In educational finance, it is obvious that as states and localities are faced with the reality of "the new federalism" and are forced to find creative ways to keep both elementary and secondary and post-secondary systems from financial default, a great deal of study and research and dissemination of information will be necessary. The NIE is the only agency in the federal government presently equipped both to do practical research in education and to distrubute information about results.

In this regard it is important to note that during the past 3 1/2 years the agency has done a superb job of maintaining relations with the Chief

State School Officers, the local education authorities, teachers and practitioners, and the other groups which make up the educational enterprise in America. The NIE has successfully avoided the potential danger of becoming an exclusive research institute with ties only to a band of university researchers.

In post-secondary education there is a small research grants program which, if maintained and nurtured, could be a very valuable asset for colleges and universities. I would suggest that research expenditure in this area could reap great benefit for post-secondary education. I would further suggest that an NIE research unit with limited expenditure of time and money could consolidate a great deal of the knowledge which has been gained through the grants program of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. FIPSE, as you know, sponsors small action-oriented experimental projects in colleges and universities and other post-secondary education settings, and while the results of these projects have been splendid, there has not been systematic evaluation and dissemination of the information gained through these projects. NIE could provide such research and dissemination.

Certain older projects at NIE which have received a great deal of funding over the years should be allowed to seek financial independence; while more promising younger projects should continue to receive nurture. Let me be more specific by stating that the Institute has funded, since its inception, a series of regional laboratories and research centers of which there are now seventeen remaining. These "labs and centers" have received nearly one-half billion dollars worth of federal funding during their life histories. My recommendation is that these seventeen institutions be curtailed in funding, that the total amount of money spent by NIE for the labs and centers be reduced by approximately 75%, and that the remaining 25% be distributed to individual projects within these institutions which are deemed to be compatible with the new priorities of the Institute. Most of these institutions, especially the

laboratories, already have considerable ability to generate resources from other than federal sources. They should be so encouraged. The truth is that if these institutions are useful to the local school systems and to the regions which they are supposed to serve, then those state and local educational authorities will be willing to pay for and buy the services of these laboratories.

The research centers present a somewhat different case. Many of them have individual projects which might be extremely valuable to new Institute priorities. But even with the research centers, great care should be taken so that the Institute does not in the future find itself in the position which exists today in which a very substantial percentage of its money for university based research goes to only five or six major universities. There should be in the future more equitable distribution of research funds amongst America's high quality universities. To achieve this equity the heavy reliance on a handful of university research centers should be re-examined.

Mr. Chairman, I have made these suggestions because I feel deeply that the National Institute of Education has made significant progress and is in fact making important contributions to education in America. None of us is pleased with the circumstances under which these suggestions have to be made. All of us would prefer that the budget for the Institute be maintained and in fact increased. I simply want to testify that from the point of view of the states, the work of the Institute has been of high quality and of great use. If the work of the Institute is to be reduced, two or three targeted topics should be selected for focus, and older projects of the Institute which have received large amounts of money over the years ought to be encouraged to seek financial independence from the federal government.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

CHARTERED 1693
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEAN
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA 23185

July 31, 1981

The Honorable Austin J. Murphy
Subcommittee on Select Education
617 House Office Building Annex #1
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Murphy:

Enclosed is the list of references for studies comparable to, but not cited in, NIE publications as you requested in your letter of July 20, 1981.

Although constrained by lack of time and accessibility to the various research reports, the primary problem was one of selecting the studies to be reviewed. Thus, the list is only illustrative of the concerns I have. In addition, I restricted my exploration to the field of reading since it is the area of my specialization. Nevertheless, my impression is that my concern of duplication and lack of an historical perspective is valid for other fields as well. I strongly suggest that you consult with carefully selected educational specialists possessing curriculum and methodology backgrounds in these other areas concerning their appraisal of the contributions of the studies conducted by NIE.

My concern is not that the NIE studies should never have been conducted. Instead, I believe research should be based upon a comprehensive knowledge base. In my view, the previoulsy conducted studies I cite, along with others, should be recognized by NIE researchers and new research built upon them. Too frequently, I believe, this is not happening in the research sponsored by NIE.

I wish to emphasize again my support for NIE and for a national involvement in educational research. Nevertheless, I believe NIE should re-evaluate its mission and procedures to better serve the needs of the educational community.

Sincerely,

Robert Emans

Robert Emans,
Associate Dean, Professor,
and Eminent Scholar

REgt

enc

REFERENCES OF

STUDIES CONDUCTED BY NIE

AND

"CLASSICS IN EDUCATION RESEARCH"

prepared for the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

at the request of

THE HONORABLE AUSTIN J. MURPHY, CHAIRMAN

by

ROBERT EMANS, ASSOCIATE DEAN,
PROFESSOR AND EMINENT SCHOLAR
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA

JULY 30, 1981

1. FISHER, DONALD L. FUNCTIONAL LITERACY AND THE SCHOOLS. WASHINGTON, D.C.: NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION, 1978

On page 55 of this bulletin the statement is made, "The Reading Activities Survey is the first major attempt to describe the reading habits and activities of adults." Actually, there have been a number of studies on adult reading habits that could probably be considered as "major." Some of these studies are listed below. Also included are references to a UNESCO study on literacy and another on comparative reading. None is included on the list of References on pages 25-26. The UNESCO study is apparently alluded to briefly on page 30-31.

Gray, William S. The Teaching of Reading: A World View. UNESCO, Paris, 1956.

Henry, Nelson B., (Ed.). Adult Reading. Fifty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Gray, William S., and Rogers, Bernice. Maturity in Reading: Its Nature and Appraisal. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Gray, William S., and Munroe, Ruth. The Reading Interests and Habits of Adults. New York: MacMillan Company, 1929.

Link, Henry C. and Hopf, Harry A. People and Books: A Study of Reading and Book Buying Habits. Book Manufacturer Institute, 1946.

Downing, John. Comparative Reading. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1973/

In the words of the author,

A major implication of the above NIE study was that "the illiteracy rate for repeaters was much, much higher than the illiteracy rate for non-repeaters." (p.18) Goodlad reported essentially the same finding in a study published in 1952: "Throughout the body of evidence runs a consistent pattern: undesirable growth characteristics and unsatisfactory school progress are more closely associated with nonpromoted children than with promoted slow-learning children." (p.154)

Goodlad, John I. "Research and Theory Regarding Promotion and Nonpromotion," The Elementary School Journal. November 1952, pp. 150-155.)

2. ANDERSON, RICHARD C. AND FREEBODY, PETER. "VOCABULARY KNOWLEDGE." IN JOHN T. GUTHRIE (ED.) COMPREHENSION AND TEACHING: RESEARCH REVIEWS. NEWARK, DELAWARE: INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION, 1981. PP.77-117.

Neither in this article (except for a brief reference to an article he co-authored) nor any place in Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension is the work on vocabulary development of Edgar Dale recognized. He has conducted substantial work on vocabulary and has served as a consultant to the World Book Encyclopedia. Among his publications are the following:

Dale, Edgar. The Words We Know: A National Inventory. Palo Alto, California: Field Educational Publications, 1973.

Dale, Edgar, Pazik, Taher and Petty, Walter. Bibliography of Vocabulary Studies. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1973.

Dale, Edgar and O'Rourke, Joseph. Techniques of Teaching Vocabulary. Palo Alto, California: Field Educational Publications, 1971.

3. ADAMS, MARILYN JAGER. "FAILURES TO COMPREHEND AND LEVELS OF PROCESSING IN READING." IN RAND J. SPIRO, BERTRAM C. BRUCE AND WILLIAM F. BREWER (EDS.), THEORETICAL ISSUES IN READING COMPREHENSION. HILLSDALE, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, 1980. PP. 11-32.

Nowhere in this entire volume is reference made to William S. Gray, the author of the "Dick and Jane" reading series and a major contributor to reading research. In this introductory chapter, the author states that her purpose is to "consider some of the processes that may be especially problematic for the young reader." (p.11) The following reference is listed as having significance to an overview of the reading process.

Gray, William S. "The Major Aspects of Reading," Sequential Development of Reading Abilities. Helen M. Robinson, Ed. pp. 8-24. Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 90. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

4. BRUCE, BERTRAM. PLANS AND SOCIAL ACTIONS, TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 34. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN: CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING, APRIL, 1977.

The author states, "Our understanding of a story is highly dependent upon our ability to recognize the underlying purpose for actions described in the story." (p.1)

Dewey recognized the importance of actions as a major component of his philosophy. For example, in Democracy and Education (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916.) Dewey states,

> To have an idea of a thing is thus not just to get certain sensations from it. It is to be able to respond to the thing in view of its place in an inclusive scheme of action; it is to foresee the drift and probable consequence of the action of the thing upon us and of our action upon it. (p.36)

Dewey's pioneering contribution to the underlying thesis of this study is not recognized.

5. SPIRO, RAND J. "CONSTRUCTIVE PROCESSES IN PHRASE COMPREHENSION AND RECALL." IN RAND J. SPIRO, BERTRAM C. BRUCE AND WILLIAM F. BREWER (EDS.) THEORETICAL ISSUES IN READING COMPREHENSION. HILLSDALE, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, 1980. PP.245-278.

In a footnote the author states,

> The findings can be summed up as follows: Most of what adults do children do, but less efficiently. If tasks demands are made simpler, children's processing more closely resembles that of adults. (p.253)

This is hardly a novel insight. In 1936, Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Camp Edwards said in The Dewey School (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company):

> Among the psychological assumptions underlying the school's theory and guiding its practices were two quite different from those accepted by traditional education. The first of these was that the needs, powers, and interests of the growing child are unlike those of maturity; but that, second, he utilizes the same general conditions as the adult in his intellectual and moral development. (p.418)

See also:

Stemmler, Anne O. Reading of Highly Creative vs. Highly Intelligent Secondary Students. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966.

82-374 O—81——6

6. BROWN, ANN L. "METACOGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT AND READING.: IN RAND J. SPIRO, BERTRAM C. BRUCE AND WILLIAM F. BREWER (EDS.), THEORETICAL ISSUES IN READING COMPREHENSION. HILLSDALE, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, 1980. PP.453-481.

See Helen K. Smith. "The Responses of Good and Poor Readers When Asked to Read for Different Purposes," Reading Research Quarterly. Fall 1967, Pp.53-83. This study was recognized by the International Reading Association with its "Outstanding-Dissertation-of-the-Year" Award.

Also note on page 477 of the NIE study, "One method we are attempting is modeled on the technology of clinical interviews." In fact, the Smith study had already used such procedures -- as have a number of other studies, e.g., one conducted by Josephine A. Piekarz, Individual Differences in Interpretive Responses in Reading. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954; and another by Mildred Letton, Individual Differences in Interpretive Responses in Reading Poetry at the Ninth-Grade Level. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.

See also:

Judd, Charles H. and Buswell, G. T. Silent Reading: A Study of the Various Types. University of Chicago Press, 1922.

Gans, Roma. A Study of Critical Reading Comprehension in the Intermediate Grades. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940.

Carroll, Robert P. An Experimental Study of Comprehension in Reading with Special Reference to the Reading of Directions. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926.

7. BREWER, WILLIAM F. "LITERARY THEORY, RHETORIC, AND STYLISTICS: IMPLICATIONS FOR PSYCHOLOGY." IN RAND J. SPIRO, BERTRAM C. BRUCE AND WILLIAM F. BREWER (EDS.), THEORETICAL ISSUES IN READING COMPREHENSION. HILLSDALE, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, 1980. PP. 221-239.

In the words of the author on page 224, "I propose that there are four basic discourse forces: to inform, to entertain, to persuade, and literary-aesthetic...." Similar "forces" were identified as long ago as 1940 in What Reading Does to People by Douglas Waples, Bernard Berelson and Franklyn R. Bradshaw, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940, Pp.74-80. No recognition is given to this work in the NIE study.

8. SHABEN, EDWARD J. "THEORIES OF SEMANTIC MEMORY: APPROACHES TO KNOWLEDGE AND SENTENCE COMPREHENSION." IN RAND J. SPIRO, BERTRAM C. BRUCE AND WILLIAM F. BREWER (EDS.), THEORETICAL ISSUES IN READING COMPREHENSION. HILLSDALE, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, 1980. PP.309-330.

The following well-known study would probably have relevance and might have contributed to an understanding on the part of the reader of the issues involved. It certainly would have done no harm to let the reader know that the author of the NIE study was familiar with it.

Ogden, C.K. and Richards, I. A. The Meaning of Meaning. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1927.

9. ANDERSON, RICHARD C. AND SHIFRIN, ZOHARA. "THE MEANING OF WORDS IN CONTEXT." IN RAND J. SPIRO, BERTRAM C. BRUCE AND WILLIAM F. BREWER (EDS.) THEORETICAL ISSUES IN READING COMPREHENSION. HILLSDALE, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, 1980. PP.331-348.

Contrast the depth of scholarship and the practical implications for reading instruction of this study with the study listed below by Wilber Ames. The Ames study was recognized by the International Reading Association with its "Outstanding-Dissertation-of-the-Year" Award.

Ames, Wilber, "The Development of a Classification Scheme of Contextual Aids," Reading Research Quarterly, Fall, 1966.

10. PEARSON, P. DAVID AND CAMPERELL, KAYBETH. "COMPREHENSION OF TEXT STRUCTURES" IN JOHN T. GUTHRIE (ED.) COMPREHENSION AND TEACHING: RESEARCH REVIEWS. NEWARK, DELAWARE: INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION, 1981. PP.34-36.

Although this study is not an NIE study as far as I can determine, the author is on the staff of the Center for the Study of Reading. Nevertheless, it and at least one NIE technical report (for which I do not presently have access) are closely related to the study cited below by Barbara Stoodt. The Stoodt study is not cited in the above reference or in the NIE study, although it received awards for excellence by both the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English.

Stoodt, Barbara. The Relationship Between Understanding Grammatical and Reading Comprehension. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1958.

In the last paragraph the above author states,

> A final caution: we don't expect that the products of this new methodological research will be altogether new and surprising. In fact, we expect that many will elicit reactions of "reinventing the wheel," or "that's just common sense." Such reactions will please us. Common sense is all too common and all too sensible to be overturned by a single line of research. But no real value in the new research will be the contextual and theoretical base from which it emanates. Hence we will be in a better position to answer the question. Why did it work? (p.50)

Such a statement does not absolve the scholar from knowing and reporting on previously conducted relevant research. It is an error to assume that only works from such areas as psychology and linguistics possess a theory base. Although not "classics," your attention is drawn to the following publication:

Emans, Robert. "Reading Theory: Bringing Points of View Together," Journal of Reading, May, 1979, pp.690-698.

11. MASON JANA AND McCORMICK, CHRISTINE. TESTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF READING AND LINGUISTIC AWARENESS. TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 126. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN: CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING, MAY, 1979.

Although the above authors cite another study by Donald Durrell they fail to report the study below that is probably more closely related to their study.

Durrell, Donald P. et.al. "Success in First Grade Reading," Journal of Education, February, 1958.

12. ADAMS, MARILYN JAGER AND COLLINS, ALLAN. A SCHEMA-THEORETIC VIEW OF READING, TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 32. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN: CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING, APRIL, 1977.

Although the work of both Goodman and Smith are recognized extensively in other [illegible] publications, they are not cited in the above technical report, as are not the other two references listed below. Whereas terminology may differ from one area of study to another, the issues explored are often similar.

See Stauffer, Russell G. Directing Reading Maturity as a Cognitive Process. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Chapter y, 1969.

Gray, "The Major Aspects of Reading," loc.cit.

Goodman, Kenneth S. "Reading: A Psycholinguistic Guessing Game," Journal of the Reading Specialist. May 1967, pp.126-135.

Smith, Frank. Understanding Reading, 2nded. New York, N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978.

The following references are listed without comment. The importance of the previously conducted study to the NIE study is self-evident.

13. HUGGINS, A.W.F. SYNTATIC ASPECTS OF READING COMPREHENSION, TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 33. URBANA-CHAMPAIGN: CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING, APRIL, 1977.

See Lefevre, Carl A. Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.

14. HUGGINS, A. W. F., AND ADAMS, MARILYN JAGER. "SYNTACTIC ASPECTS OF READING COMPREHENSION." IN RAND J. SPIRO, BERTRAM C. BRUCE AND WILLIAM F. BREWER (EDS.), THEORETICAL ISSUES IN READING COMPREHENSION. HILLSDALE, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, 1980. PP.87-112.

See Jenkinson, Marion Dixon. Selected Processes of Reading Comprehension. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1957.

15. RUBIN, ANDEE. "A THEORETICAL TAXONOMY OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ORAL AND WRITTEN LANGUAGE." IN RAND J. SPIRO, BERTRAM C. BRUCE AND WILLIAM F. BREWER (EDS.) THEORETICAL ISSUES IN READING COMPREHENSION. HILLSDALE, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, 1980. PP.411-438.

See Bougere, Marguerite Bondy. "Selected Factors in Oral Language Related to First-Grade Reading Achievement," Reading Research Quarterly, Fall, 1964, Pp.31-58. The research reported in this study was recognized for excellence by the International Reading Association through its "Outstanding-Dissertation-of-the-Year" Award.

16. ASHER, STEVEN R. "TOPIC INTEREST AND CHILDREN'S READING COMPREHENSION." IN RAND J. SPIRO, BERTRAM C. BRUCE AND WILLIAM F. BREWER (EDS.) THEORETICAL ISSUES IN READING COMPREHENSION. HILLSDALE, NEW JERSEY: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, 1980. PP.525-534.

See Rankin, Marie. Children's Interests in Library Books of Fiction. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1944.

Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

College of Education
Reading Clinic
815 753 1416

August 12, 1981

The Honorable Austin J. Murphy
House of Representatives
Subcommittee on Select Education
617 House Office Building Annex #1
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Murphy:

I am pleased to respond to your letter of July 20 requesting additional information related to my testimony before the Subcommittee on Select Education on June 18.

Two of your questions require expanded answers so I will attach a separate document on items 1 and 3 in your letter.

You have asked if products such as Research Within Reach developed at CEMREL might be jeopardized if the centers are forced to compete for their funds. I do not see this as a problem. In fact, if the centers were competitive, I should think their efforts would be focused more on even better dissemination products in the future. There are many other resources we can turn to for research summaries without ever thinking of any of the centers. For example, Professor A. Sterl Artley, University of Missouri, compiled a similar research summary in 1968 entitled Trends and Practices in Secondary Reading, prepared under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. Professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the International Reading Association regularly publish summaries similar to Research Within Reach. In some cases, particular universities undertake their own regular summaries. At the University of Arizona, seven volumes of research summaries and reports have been published under the auspices of their Reading Education faculty. I feel sure this situation is true in other disciplines as well.

I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts with you and the members of the committee.

Sincerely,

James E. Walker

James E. Walker
President, College
Reading Association

JEW/kjc

Northern Illinois University is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

RESEARCH OUT OF REACH

A Statement Prepared at the Request of the Subcommittee on Select Education

The Committee has asked for documentation for the claim that much of the NIE-funded research is esoteric. One illustration lies in the terminology used by the researchers in reading, many of whom apparently do not know or use common terms used by reading educators. The following words are not contained in the Dictionary of Reading and Learning Disabilities Terms, compiled by Clifford L. Bush and Robert C. Andrews, Matawan, NJ: Educational and Psychological Associates Press, 1973. These terms are taken from only thirty-four Technical Reports I have reviewed from The Center for the Study of Reading:

componential representation
conceptual peg hypothesis
constituent propositions
connectivity hypotheses
discourse anaphora
embedded anomalies
extensional elaborations
hierarchial clustering schemes
instantiation
instrumentalist position
intensional elaborations
internal report
internal state words
lexical decision task
metacognition
metamnemonic efficiency
orthographic activation
phonological activation
polysemous words
proactive interference
referential communication
semanticity
subschemata
social cognition
story grammars

I might borrow a line from Technical Report 159, pg. 29 which says: "The tolerance for vagueness characteristic of much psychological literature is only partially justified by the difficulty of the problem. One thing is certain: tolerance for vagueness is deterimental to progress."

Another reason for saying the research is esoteric is that much of the research is done by psychologists, apparently for psychologists. Technical Report #146: Theoretical Issues in the Investigation of Words of Internal

Report has twenty-three references, none of them recognizable to reading educators. Most of the references are to psychology journals. The same is true of Technical Reports #21, 68, 115, 121, 125, 127, 136, 140, 142, 144, 147, 148, 151, 159, 163, 167, 168, 171, 173, 175, 176, 179, 180, 183, 184. This represents twenty-six of the thirty-four Technical Reports that I have reviewed.

Research work should build on prior research and not "reinvent the wheel." Professor Emans who also testified to the Select Subcommittee wrote an article in 1979 in which he carefully detailed a series of studies completed recently as being so similar to writings done over twenty years ago but with different terminologies. (Cf. Journal of Reading, May 1979.)

Similarly, in a letter to your Committee dated July 1, Professor Emans said that research findings should be cumulative. He continues that "adequate scholarship requires that prior research from many sources be documented before new projects be undertaken." And yet, Professor Tuinman from Simon Fraser University in British Columbia wrote in an article, "The Schema Schemers" (Cf. Journal of Reading, February 1980.) that "psychology has been repeatedly criticized for failing to link new hypotheses, new theorizing to the concepts and data base of the immediately preceding psychological fashion." For NIE-sponsored research related to reading to ignore what the reading professionals have already found out is inexcusable except for the fact that most psychologists have no idea of what reading authorities have already learned about their discipline. Psychologists such as those doing the reading research today start within the context of their own discipline as is evident by an inspection of most research report bibliographies.

In the January 1962 issue of The Reading Teacher, Professor George D. Spache, Emeritus of the University of Florida, wrote a commentary, "Is This a Breakthrough in Reading?" His title could be used again today when we look at some of the Technical Reports and read:

> Individuals who score high on a vocabulary test are likely to know more of the words in most texts they encounter than low scoring individuals. (Reading Education Report 11)

> In two experiments, subjects who completed the last words of sentences they read learned more than subjects who simply read whole sentences. (Technical Report 21)

> No student of psychology can be ignorant of the long history of this topic (Training Studies in Cognitive Development) and the controversy, rational and irrational, that it has evoked. To deal with these issues adequately in a limited space would be impossible and, therefore, the interested reader is referred to a list of papers cited above for details of the problem as it concerns the intelligent functioning of retarded individuals. (Technical Report 127)

> Text information relevant to questions was learned better than text information irrelevant to questions....A good account of these results is provided by a theory which asserts that readers selectively allocate a greater volume of attention to question-relevant information, and a process supported by the additional attention causes more of the information to be learned. (Technical Report 183)

> The results indicated that the Letter and Word Reading Test is reliable and highly predictive (of success in reading). (Technical Report 126.) But, Donald D. Durrell, Professor Emeritus of Boston University, told us that 23 years ago in his report: Success in First Grade Reading.

> Schemata can also embed one with another. There can be a dominant schema containing numerous subschemata. The subschemata relate to the dominant schema, but some subschema may be less central to the dominant schema than others. (Technical Report 120)

> Jenkins, Pany, & Schreck found that providing the meanings of words, practicing their meanings, and learning meanings from context were at least somewhat better than no instruction at all for average and below-average middle school readers. (Technical Report 100) Comment: Any teacher could have told us this.

Research Subjects

The Co-director of the Center for the Study of Reading wrote in The Reading Teacher (Cf. January 1979) that the NIE contract "called for basic research into the processes underlying the development of reading comprehension by children in the intermediate grades (3-8) (Emphasis added.) Why then are so many studies done for what seems to be convenience sake in the professors' own classes? Examples:

> 96 undergraduate students in an introductory educational psychology course participated in this study to fulfill part of the course requirements. (Technical Report 21)
>
> The subjects were 64 adults between the ages of 18 and 30 and were recruited from both the undergraduate and graduate classes at Washington University. (Technical Report 68)
>
> Subjects were 20 educational psychology undergraduates who participated to fulfill course requirements. (Technical Report 60)
>
> Thirty-six children ages 4½ to 5 and their teachers and parents were the subjects. (Technical Report 125)
>
> Teacher judgment was used to identify three proficient and three poor readers in each of the grades 2,4,6, and 8. This was acknowledged as a limitation of the study. (Technical Report 120)
>
> One group of twelve five-year-olds and one group of 12 seven-year-olds heard stories with a naughty protagonist, (Technical Report 142)
>
> The subjects were 74 undergraduates enrolled in an introductory psychology class, who participated in order to fulfill a course requirement. (Technical Report 144)
>
> Subjects were 106 first semester freshmen from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign....The text was a 4926 word discussion of physiological psychology developed from the chapter summaries of a physiological psychology textbook. (Technical Report 140)
>
> Subjects were 40 preschool children (4.5--5.0 years) (Technical Report 148

The subjects were 80 students enrolled in psychology courses at the University of Washington, who received class credit for their participation. (Technical Report 151)

The 28 subjects were randomly assigned to eight social situations such that there were four subjects per social situation. (Technical Report 167)

**Does 8x4 = 28?

Twenty children from daycare centers in the Champaign-Urbana area were used as subjects. There were 10 children in an age range 2-4 to 2-11. There were 10 more children 3-0 to 3-5. The adult sample consisted of 20 college freshmen and sophomore who participated in the experiment as part of the course requirements for Introductory Psychology. (Technical Report 171)

**Thirty-two members of the Columbia University community served as subjects and were paid $3.50. (Technical Report 176)

The subjects were 77 college students enrolled in an educational psychology course. They participated as part of a class require-
**ment and also received $2.00. (Technical Report 183)

Some groups of deaf children had 2 or 3 and no more than 6 subjects. (Technical Report 184)

I wonder if perhaps so much research is being done in college courses to meet some kind of quota system for generating the Technical Reports. The students studied are clearly not the focus which is suggested in the Co-Director's statement referred to earlier.

The Research Delay

There are several reasons why I have indicated that the research being conducted today will take twenty-five years before it is implemented in the classroom.

For one, research conclusions arrived at many years ago by reading authorities are being ignored. Today's research is being done by researchers who are virtually totally ignorant of the field of reading and they are generating already known information.

Research at the Center for the Study of Reading was supposed to be aimed

at children in grades 3 through 8. Many examples of research clearly off this target have been cited. Too much time is being spent on researching students in college courses and not in classrooms.

There is no immediate application that can be made under the conditions in which so much research has already been attempted. If after 187 Technical Reports we can see no evidence of a Master Plan to all these efforts, I suggest that a halt be put to these feeble and wandering efforts, targeted, it would seem, at simply grinding out reports for their own sake. Basic research, granted, is important to some understandings of comprehension. But where is the Plan behind all these 187 reports?

The research must be focused on what is happening in classrooms, not on university campuses. I submit that reading professionals, not psychologists who almost completely ignore the reading professionals, be allowed to research in their own field. Research must be located in the schools. It is far more preferred to research questions according to a Master Plan for answering specific questions rather than to assemble a crew of researchers who can only function in their own laboratories. A perusal of the titles of the 187 Technical Reports suggests no systematic plan for what has been done over the past five years. Consequently, to continue on this course will simply provide us with research that is out of reach.

CHARTERED 1693
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEAN
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA 23185

August 20, 1981

Dr. Milton Goldberg, Acting Director
National Institute of Education
1200 - 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Milt:

Thank you for your letter of July 31, 1981. I must admit, however, that I am puzzled at your reaction to my testimony before the Subcommittee on Select Education. Since you still seem to misunderstand my position, I will restate it in this letter. I am also taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Murphy.

My remarks at the hearing like those of the others who testified, including yourself I am sure, reflected a genuine concern that NIE should have the greatest possible influence on American education. Your letter of July 31 reinforces my concern about the present activities of NIE.

NIE cannot have a significant effect on schooling until it establishes constructive ties with that group of educators who hold both the ability and the position to have the greatest influence on classroom practices. While all educators are potential consumers and producers of the products of NIE, nevertheless, there are some educators who hold more pivotal positions in the communications network.

In a final analysis, there is probably little disagreement that the ultimate clients of NIE are neither "the men and women struggling to deal most directly with the major educational problems which face our country today" (as you state in your letter) nor professors of education (whom I would also include among these men and women struggling directly with educational problems). Instead the ultimate benefactors must be the learners in the various schools of this nation--be they for elementary, high school, or adult learners. I appreciate the efforts of NIE to have its researched-based information widely used, and also its desire to foster good relations with educators in general. I am also sympathetic to NIE's attempts to have some measure of direct contact with practitioners, including school superintendents and teachers. Nevertheless, I believe that it is imperative for NIE to identify correctly a category of most influential clients, whether they be called "primary audiences," "direct users" or "pivotal interpreters" who can make the most responsible use of the products of NIE.

NIE should not seek to have direct contact with the hundreds of thousands of teachers, superintendents and other school personnel, just as it should not expect to teach directly the millions of children and other learners in our schools. This would hopelessly dilute its meager resources. Neither can classroom practitioners be adequately equipped to make direct use of the technical and specialized information developed by NIE researchers, and which must be the primary focus of NIE activity. I agree with Dr. B. Othanel Smith, whom I quoted from a publication of the U. S. Department of Education in my testimony before the Subcommittee on Select Education: it is the college professor of education that must do most of the interpretation of research findings and rationalize it in a curriculum.

Similarly, I believe that it is not enough, as Dr. Smith seems to suggest, to merely identify college professors of education in general as the interpretors of educational research. Thus, I went one step further in my testimony and made assertions as to the various types of college professors of education that must serve as the pivotal interpretors of the findings of educational research for classroom use. Although professors of educational psychology have an important function in education, the pivotal interpretors of educational research for classroom practice are professors of methodology. I recognize, as you do, that NIE at its headquarters and in its laboratories and centers does have some, what I might call, "professors of methodology types" on its staff. On the other hand, the proportion of "professors of methodology types" to the number of "professors of educational psychology types" is relatively small. I make this assertion based, not only upon my own observations as a consumer of NIE products, but upon a statement made by a member of your own staff. Furthermore, in your own letter of July 31, you appear to verify my concern when you state, "If my memory serves me correctly, there are about as many doctorates in education at NIE--in fields as diverse as curriculum and instruction to administration--as there are in psychology." If I interpret your statement correctly, you are saying that there are as many psychologists at NIE as there are specialists in all areas of education combined. You do not specifically select out the proportion of those individuals with doctorates in education who specialize in curriculum and instruction, but presumably it would be some relatively small fraction of fifty percent. Thus, you are clearly indicating in your letter that NIE employs substantially more specialists in psychology than in methodology.

Contrary to your statement in your letter that you are "not sure that it is terribly important," the consequence of this imbalance of specialists has had a negative effect on the nature and use of the products that NIE has produced. Seemingly, the majority of educational psychologists conducting research for NIE, for one reason or another, do not have an adequate grounding in the knowledge of educational research which solves problems identified by professors of methodology. From their perspective much of NIE research is redundant or tangential to classroom practices. This circumstance has developed because much of the research that NIE conducts is not built upon the cumulative knowledge base of educational research that extends over a period of more than fifty years.

Neither is it sufficient to develop liaison relationships merely between deans of education and NIE. Few deans of education are specialists in methodology. although of course, some have such backgrounds. My informal research in this matter leads me to conclude that the majority of deans, who comprise much of the membership of AACTE, come from either educational administration or some specialty other than methodology. Thus, as I advocated in my testimony before the Subcommittee on Select Education, NIE needs to establish relationships with professors of methodology. New linkages will have to be developed; relying on AACTE, as you indicate in your letter, is not enough. It will not be easy and will require working with their many and diverse associations; but it must be done if NIE is to be more effective.

Finally, I believe that I did not misunderstand the significance of Dr. Greene's statement. Although Dr. Greene may not feel the need for funds to support her own research, there are many professors of the history or the philosophy of education who would welcome such support. NIE must support and synthesize the research needs of all areas of education.

As I think you know, I believe that it is vital to have a healthy NIE to provide for the effective involvement of the federal government in education and also to maintain strong schools in the United States. In addition, I believe that in order to be a responsible organization NIE must change and grow by studying and evaluating its mission and practices. One legitimate source of information should come from concerned educators like those of us who testified before the Subcommittee on Select Education last June 18.

Sincerely,

Bob

Robert Emans,
Associate Dean

REgt

cc Congressman Austin Murphy

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208

9 SEP 1981

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

The Honorable Austin J. Murphy
Chairman, Subcommittee on Select Education
Committee on Education and Labor
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In response to your letter of July 20, I am enclosing responses to your questions regarding the National Institute of Education.

Please accept my apologies for the delay in providing you with this information. I understand, however, that my staff have been in touch with your office several times in August regarding these questions and were assured that the delay was not hindering publication of the hearing record.

I trust this information is of some help to you.

Sincerely,

Milton Goldberg
Acting Director

Enclosure

1.

Q. What is the process you use to determine research priorities? What process is used to verify that research is needed, that it has not been done elsewhere and that NIE involvement is the most effective way to meet the need?

A. The Institute's general research priorities are set by Congress in Section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act which directs NIE to focus on several priority areas including achievement in the basic skills, finance and productivity in education, and dissemination of the results of educational research and development. In general, NIE has interpreted its statutory priorities as requiring the agency to focus upon research and development activities which enhance equity in education and help improve local educational practice.

The statutory mission of the Institute is advanced under the general direction of the National Council on Educational Research (NCER), the policymaking council which is an integral part of NIE. Last year, for example, the NCER adopted a policy requiring the Institute to develop an agency-wide implementation plan to improve dissemination. The dissemination policy is the latest in a series of policy statements by the Council on such varied issues as the role of fundamental research in work supported by NIE, and limitations on curriculum development by the agency.

Within the general policy guidelines established by the Congress and the NCER, specific research activities are established in NIE's research planning process designed to ensure (1) that the views of a wide range of audiences are taken into account; and (2) that the work is needed, will contribute to the mission of enhancing equity and advancing practice, and does not duplicate other research.

The research planning process is based upon wide consultation and expressions of interest from the educational practice community, the Congress, educational researchers, and others including officials of the U.S. Department of Education. The agency considers, for example, the views of teachers and other educators on the kinds of information they need, as well as researchers' opinions about the research that will offer the greatest potential for payoff. The priorities are then communicated to the research programs and their research areas in a "Planning Guidance Memorandum." Because some research requires a number of years to reach fruition, priorities do not change rapidly or capriciously. They do change in the light of new research findings and changing information needs, but not at the cost of stability in the research program.

Detailed planning takes place--in the light of the Institute's general priorities--at the level of the "research area." Within NIE's three main programs there are over thirty research areas. These are groups of projects and studies addressing major issues, policy questions, or information needs. A few examples of research areas include Reading, Testing, Basic Cognitive Skills and Mathematics, Educational Finance, School Management Organization, and Urban Education.

82-374 O—81——7

The research planning process has several components. Research area staff review the literature concerning their field to make sure that the research proposed for funding will expand or improve the state of knowledge. Sometimes earlier research must be replicated or reexamined to enhance the confidence which can be placed in research results. Institute staff indicate how the proposed research will contribute to improved educational practice (teaching, learning, administering schools), greater educational equity, and other priorities such as enhanced quality of education. They also indicate what consultations they have held with practitioners and others to learn about their information needs and their views of the proposed research. Each research area plan then indicates the studies proposed over the coming three years, their sequence and cost, and their priority within the research area for zero-base budgeting.

The Institute has found that this planning process has produced comprehensive information on which NIE's Director can base budget and priority decisions, and the response from the educational research and practitioners in the field to the Institute's plans has been quite positive.

2.

Q. Other offices in the Department of Education have authority and funding to support specific research. What system do you have to assure that research efforts are coordinated between the Institute and these offices? Specifically, what relationship does NIE maintain with the Office of Special Education to develop and coordinate priorities for research in special education?

A. The Institute relies on several processes through which its leadership and staff are informed of and interact in the research efforts of other components of the Department of Education. In the Department's annual budget and planning process, the Institute shares its plans with other Departmental offices, and Institute staff review plans concerning the programs and projects under way or proposed in other components; e.g., the ED Evaluation Plan.

There are formal mechanisms which assure that NIE's research activities regarding bilingual education and vocational education are coordinated and complementary. However, Institute staff also maintain liaison with other ED staff regarding those programs which are relevant to Institute research. Institute staff have leadership roles on three interagency committees: Early Childhood Research and Development, Adolescence, and Adult Learning. A recent research forum brought together over 250 researchers concerned with early childhood and adolescence research. This interagency participation keeps NIE staff knowledgeable of research sponsored, not only in the Department, but elsewhere in the Federal government as well.

Although there is no formal mechanism linking NIE with the Office of Special Education (OSE), Institute staff do work with its research staff. NIE staff have participated in the planning and procurement review process on a number of studies, such as the special education finance study, rural special education delivery systems study, etc. The Research Grants Program on Law and Government in Education staff have participated in reviews of proposals received by OSE and consulted with OSE staff on research proposals concerning educational policy implications of handicapped legislation. This coordination assures that any NIE research on special education supports and complements that of OSE.

3.

Q. In 1976, Congress mandated the National Institute of Education to conduct a study on vocational education. Through competition this study was awarded to a consulting firm in Berkeley, California. Yet the Department of Education has just awarded a $5.5 million contract to the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (an NIE research and demonstration center) to do research in the area of vocational education. How can the Department of Education and the National Institute of Education justify this apparent duplication?

A. The background information included in this question is incomplete. In 1976 Congress directed that several provisions be implemented in the former Office of Education and the National Institute of Education, including the following three: (1) NIE should conduct a study of vocational education similar to the evaluation of Title I of ESEA, then under way, which was conducted under competitive procedures; (2) NIE should fund 17 labs and centers, including the Center for Vocational Research at Ohio State University; and (3) the Commissioner of Education should create a national center for research on vocational education through competition. The House report on the 1976 amendments which included an explanation of the need for such a national center stated:

> "The choice of this national center...must be made on a competitive basis, but the Committee does want to highly commend the work which has been performed by the Center for Vocational Research at Ohio State University. That Center has performed many of the functions envisioned by the amendments for this new national research center, and it has the potential to perform a number of the other functions. However, the Committee wants to stress that the Commissioner is to open the competition for the designation of this national center to every institution in the country which desires to compete..."

No other institutions competed for the award for the national center and upon winning it, the Center for Vocational Research changed its name to the National Center for Research on Vocational Education (NCRVE). NCRVE did not bid on any of the procurements issued as part of the NIE study of vocational education.

In order to reduce the apparent duplication involved with NCRVE receiving two separate awards, from two separate offices, under two separate Congressional directives, NIE has renegotiated its scope of work with the Center so that NCRVE's award from NIE involves a broader set of issues than vocational education. NCRVE's work for NIE is concentrated not simply upon vocational education but upon youth policy studies, including youth employment and basic and employability skills for youth. In addition, NIE and Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) staff meet regularly to ensure that the two contracts do not involve duplication of effort.

4.

Q. I have enclosed a letter from Dr. Lois Bader in which she refers to research being funded as new research when it has, in fact, been conducted previously. Dr. Robert Emans raised the same issue in his testimony before the subcommittee. Would you please respond to this concern?

A. Drs. Bader and Emans have leveled a serious charge at the professional integrity of NIE staff, reviewers, and grantees. We would like to observe, however, that the example provided does not support the charge.

The allegation that the Center for the Study of Reading's (CSR) analysis of social studies texts duplicates work done under the Michigan Social Studies Textbook Study reveals a misunderstanding of both pieces of research. The Michigan study is concerned with the treatment given race, culture, and gender in four published textbooks. In contrast, the CSR research on social studies texts deals with their coherence, intelligibility, and the degree to which they organize material for ease of comprehension.

True, both studies analyze social studies texts. To claim, however, that they are duplicative is incorrect. The Michigan study can help the publishers of four specific textbooks meet the state's needs for books that deal equitably with issues of race, culture, and gender; the CSR research yields general principles that all publishers can use to make their books easier to understand and more effective in conveying the concepts of history or civics to students.

Quite apart from this specific instance, two observations contained in the response to Question 1--which asked about the determination of research priorities, including the issue of duplicative research--should be repeated.

First, the research planning process at NIE, involving NIE staff and external constituents, is designed in part to guard against duplication of existing research, whether funded at NIE or elsewhere.

Second, in some cases, duplication is to be desired so that earlier findings can be confirmed: "Sometimes earlier research must be replicated or reexamined to enhance the confidence which can be placed in research results."

5.

Q. Dr. Emans, also in his testimony, argued that professors who are responsible for teaching methods courses are the primary consumers of the findings of education research, yet that NIE has, by and large, ignored this group. How does NIE address the needs of methods teachers, and are these professors included in the process for identification and development of research projects?

A. NIE works in many ways to assist professors of educational methods in training teachers and educational program specialists:

- We make project reports available to students and faculty of education schools. Most universities' library systems contain complete ERIC collections; Swem Library at the College of William and Mary has such a collection. The ERIC system includes copies of all NIE-supported research reports; and our researchers also customarily publish the results of their work in journals, conference proceedings, and other publications.

- NIE systematically involves methods professors and reading educators in planning and developing our research program. The agency uses reading educators as consultants and asks for their reactions to our research area plans in reading, and the same is true of our work in writing, mathematics, and other areas. We have sought and received organizational responses to our research area plans from the International Reading Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and similar organizations. These groups include classroom teachers in the given areas and are also the principal organizations of education school faculty in those areas.

- Our review panels include people who represent research and practice; these are almost always methods professors who are also competent judges and users of research.

- NIE's working relationships with the deans of the Colleges of Education, both individually and through the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), have been firm and positive. The board of AACTE regularly comments on our work and its relevance to their concerns. And, the Institute's programs reflect recommendations made to us by the deans.

- Many of our publications are used as basic source materials in undergraduate and graduate education courses around the country. And, NIE has undertaken numerous activities to help education school faculty to use research findings in the process of educational improvement. Our dissemination program includes regional research and development programs designed to apply research reports to practical problems faced by local educators, curriculum developers, teacher trainers, and others. We have published Research Within Reach volumes on reading and mathematics, designed to demonstrate that research findings can be useful in addressing prevalent problems or issues in reading or mathematics instruction.

Our staff includes professionals trained at education schools in educational methods (including our research-management staff in reading and language studies), so we are familiar with the roles that methods professors play in education. We understand that it is they who are primarily responsible for introducing research on a given skill-area to education students, and that they will typically conduct research seminars or class units in which research such as that funded by NIE is used to explain or design the instructional methods their students are learning. We also understand that the accessibility of research and its applicability determine the success of this process; and we are planning a 1982 Summer Institute on Reading, in which researchers, reading educators, teachers, and local administrators will work together to develop the best possible instructional and teacher-training methods based on contemporary research.

In order to complete the record on this issue, I am enclosing a copy of my letter to Dr. Emans in response to his courtesy in supplying me with a copy of his follow-up written testimony to you.

31 JUL 1981

Mr. Robert Emans
Associate Dean
College of William and Mary
School of Education
Office of the Dean
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

Dear Bob:

Thank you for your letter of July 6, and the attached copy of your follow-up testimony on the National Institute of Education (NIE).

I must say that I was surprised when at the June 18 hearing you objected to NIE's characterization of its primary audiences as students, parents, teachers, administrators and policymakers and asserted the pre-eminence of professors of educational methods courses. Of course we work with the trainers of America's future teachers. Many of our publications are used as basic source materials in college courses around the country. Further, our working relationships with the Deans of the Colleges of Education both individually and through AACTE have been firm and positive. The board of AACTE regularly comments on our work and its relevance to their concerns. We believe our programs reflect recommendations made to us by the Deans. But our primary audiences must continue to be the men and women struggling to deal most directly with the major educational problems which face our country today.

Your statement of July 1, approaches the subject from a different perspective by stating that NIE is "under the control of educational psychologists" and not "functions more as a national institute of psychology than of education." You also note that NIE made no claim that its staff had "been engaged in a scholarly study of curriculum and teaching methodology, from other than a psychological point of view."

I am not sure that it is terribly important, but I do want to set the record straight. On June 18, I said: "Two-thirds of our professional staff possess the earned doctorate--mostly in the fields of education and psychology, but also in such areas as linguistics, reading, statistics, and mathematics." If my memory serves me correctly, there are about as many doctorates in education at NIE--in fields as diverse as curriculum and instruction to administration as there are in psychology. As you know, my own degree is in curriculum and

Instruction. One final point: I believe you misunderstood Dr. Greene's statement to the subcommittee. Dr. Greene stated that her area of speciality was the history and philosophy of education—an area which did not require extensive research support.

Sincerely,

/s/

Milton Goldberg
Acting Director

MGoldberg/11/7/29/81/rewritten

FILE COPY

OFFICE	SURNAME	DATE	OFFICE	SURNAME	DATE	OFFICE	SURNAME	DATE
Exec	Willem	7/29/81						

6.

Q. Dr. Emans also stated in a letter, which I have enclosed, that "NIE presently functions more as a national institute of psychology than of education." Would you please respond to this assertion.

A. Dr. Emans' assertion that NIE functions "more as a national institute of psychology than of education" is puzzling. There are 30 doctorates in education at NIE--in fields as diverse as curriculum and instruction, methods, and administration--compared to 24 in psychology.

I would like to point out, in addition, that the charge infers that the Institute funds too many psychologists, especially in the area of reading. From its beginnings in the 1880's, research on reading has been predominantly psychological research. The tendency to view reading as a psychological process has been firmly in place since 1908, when Edmund Burke Huey published his landmark volumes, The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading. Many of the nation's best-known psychologists (E.L. Thorndike, R.S. Woodword, J.B. Carroll, G.A. Miller) have been fascinated with reading and have widely promoted its study among their followers. Moreover, the study of the mind and its processes, especially those serving reading and other language functions, is an area of renewed interest in the scientific community. We believe we would be derelict indeed if we did not encourage this area of research and attempt to channel the efforts of psychologists in educationally useful ways.

Dr. Emans' letter of July 1 also notes that NIE made no claim that its staff had "been engaged in a scholarly study of curriculum and teaching methodology, from other than a psychological point of view." It is important that the record be set straight on this issue. On June 18, I said: "Two-thirds of our professional staff possess the earned doctorate--mostly in the fields of education and psychology, but also in such areas as linguistics, reading, statistics, and mathematics."

7.

Q. NIE has been criticized for drawing its research from too narrow a base. Is the NIE research community in any sense a closed circle? Does, as has been asserted, a "network of personal relationships" preclude impartial reviews of proposals?

A. The Institute does not concur with either allegation. We pride ourselves on the way in which the agency has created a broad base of participation by people in the field of educational practice and education research and development.

- The Institute's use of external reviewers of both grant applications and NIE programs and projects is another instance of its extensive use of a diverse range of people from the field. In FY 1980, 1,089 external reviewers participated in the review of grant applications, 38 percent of whom were minorities and 49 percent women. Approximately one-third of those external reviewers were education practitioners.

- NIE has sought input from the field of education, including education researchers, state and local education policymakers, professional associations, educational practitioners, and parents, on research plans, research initiatives, and program operations.

- The diversity of vendors receiving NIE awards also indicated a wide range of applicants. Profit and nonprofit organizations account for 49 percent of our FY 80 awards, colleges and universities account for 44 percent, state and local governments 5 percent, and individuals 2 percent.

- The view that the same people are getting the Institute money from year to year does not take into account the following: (1) Many awards, competitively won, are frequently multi-year in nature; and (2) nearly 40% of the agency's funding has been restricted, under Congressional direction, to 17 regional educational laboratories and educational research and development centers.

8.

Q. Another question raised in the hearings was of the generalizability of some NIE funded research. The issue is whether research is funded which involves as few as four to six teachers and their students in university community schools and, if such research is funded, whether generalizations are drawn from it. Is there NIE funded research which would fit this description and, if so, to what purpose does NIE apply its results?

A. NIE has funded research studying four to six teachers and their students, and some of these projects have been conducted in university communities. When research addresses characteristics of students, a sample of that size (4 to 6 teachers) may be completely appropriate, because the classes of 4-6 elementary-school teachers would contain 100-150 students, and this would often be an ample number to find out about children's learning processes. Most researchers, including myself, would not generalize from a sample involving only university communities, and the representativeness of the sample is always a major consideration in our technical reviews of proposals and reports.

Since Dr. Bader who raised this particular issue on June 18 was involved in the design of just such a study while associated with the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State Universitiy, I will use that study as an example. A series of research studies was designed to map thinking and decision-making among expert reading diagnosticians, with the intention of finding out how to train regular classroom teachers to diagnose reading problems. Researchers working in other areas of human decision-making, including Nobel Prize winner Herbert Simon, have found it advantageous to rely upon small-sample, but in-depth, studies.

The research conducted on the thinking processes of reading diagnosticians involved a very carefully designed set of studies, each replicating the last and adding a new component to it. The set of six studies relied upon an accumulated sample of 74 diagnosticians.

For each case that a reading diagnostician diagnosed in the study, at least two hours of both the diagnostician's and researcher's time was required. To analyze the material for each case, an additional two days of the researcher's time was required. By relying on such a series of studies involving such in-depth analyses, the researchers were able to combine the strengths of small-sample, in-depth research, while at the same time increasing the sample size to the point that the findings would be more generalizable. In the case of the research conducted on reading diagnosis, several communities, including Detroit and Chicago, were involved in the set of studies.

For reasons of economy, some researchers may conduct their projects close to their institutions when this is appropriate. In some cases, this means that children in the sample live in the college or university community, and our investigators have been sensitive to alleviate any bias this could cause. Most of our projects deliberately involve school districts whose characteristics will be most appropriate to the purposes of the study, and this is usually not the district closest to the investigators' institution. For example, research done by our Center for the Study of Reading (CSR) has involved over 18,000 children in 90 different schools distributed around the country.

9.

Q. Please give us a status report on the NIE efforts to increase the participation of women and minorities in NIE funded research.

A. Over the years, NIE has focused on increasing the representation of women and minorities in the agency's work force and addressing research to the concerns of these groups. These efforts have been part of the agency's basic objective of ensuring that the Institute's staff and contractors at all levels reflect the diversity of our society. The Institute's leadership is convinced that this policy is the most effective way to guarantee that the concerns of minorities and women will be reflected in the NIE research program. The success of these efforts can be seen in the following statistics appearing in a 1980 analysis:

- Of the 38 senior management positions at the Institute, 11 were filled by minorities and 13 by women.
- Of the top six management positions at NIE, three were filled by women, two of whom were minorities.

NIE pursues a number of strategies for encouraging the participation of minorities and women in NIE-funded research. The NIE Director has instructed the staff to develop specific goals and timetables for the adequate representation of women and minorities at each of the 17 educational laboratories and centers. This joint initiative with the labs and centers will take place within the structure of the long-term agreements between NIE and each institution. These goals will be pursued in spite of the practical difficulties presented by tenure regulations at the centers, and the fact that each of these institutions receives funding from sources other than the Federal government, as well as from other Federal agencies.

The Institute's Unsolicited Proposal Program provides an example of the participation of minorities and women in NIE grant programs. A 1980 analysis shows that 30 percent of the funded proposals in this program were awarded to minority and women researchers, while 13 percent of the funded proposals were awarded to minority firms. We feel the agency can still make substantial improvement in these figures through the work of our outreach programs for minorities and women. These include:

A. The Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization Program (SADBUP), which is designed to offer incentives to minority research firms for conducting education research sponsored by NIE programs. Eleven awards were made under this program in FY 80. A new round of awards is planned for FY 81. The objective is to increase the number of minority firms familiar with education research projects funded by NIE, thereby increasing the number of strong proposers for competitive awards. To this end, the agency also continues the practice of announcing at the beginning of each program year those planned procurements which are particularly suitable for the kinds of corporate capacity offered by 8(a) firms.

B. The Experimental Program for Opportunities in Advanced Study and Research in Education (the Minorities and Women's Program) has a dual mission: (1) to increase the participation of minorities and women in education R&D, and (2) to develop and study a variety

of models for providing opportunities for them to enhance their qualifications and performance in R&D. Support is currently provided for the following: internships in government or research agencies that provide opportunities for involvement in research activities, fellowships in university settings which bring together recognized researchers in major R&D institutions of higher education with faculty of developing institutions, and R&D workshops designed to enhance the research skills of participants. A major study of these activities is now under way, and it is our intent to disseminate the results of that study, particularly as they relate to strategies which can effectively be utilized by universities, R&D organizations, SEA's, LEA's, and the Federal government to increase the participation of minorities and women in educational R&D.

Finally, NIE consistently seeks out and selects expert women and minority reviewers to participate in the process of reviewing grant applications. A 1980 analysis shows that, of the 1,089 reviewers, 38 percent were minorities and 49 percent were women. Such participation increases familiarity of these reviewers with NIE programs and provides them an opportunity to participate in the Institute's grants-making process.

10.

Q. Who does NIE consider its audience? How does NIE determine the research needs of this audience? How does NIE disseminate information to this audience? How does NIE evaluate the effectiveness of these needs assessments and dissemination methods?

A. Given NIE's dual mission of enhancing equity and improving educational practice, the Institute believes that the Congress, Federal policymakers, states and state legislators, school superintendents and administrators, teachers, parents, and students are appropriate NIE audiences.

The Institute designs its research agenda in collaboration with members of its audience to ensure that planned NIE research focuses on current critical national educational issues. This collaborative process involves: discussions with NIE staff; regular meetings of such networks as the urban school superintendents, the Chief State School Officers, and the National Conference of State Legislatures; communication with such groups as the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and the National Council of Teachers of English; and national and regional conferences that include representatives from the various audiences. NIE uses these meetings, conferences, and networks not only to determine research needs, but also to disseminate research findings. In addition, NIE makes available numerous publications, guides and handbooks, and various forms of technical assistance to all the audiences interested in educational research and development. Examples of the types of information that NIE has provided to its audiences include the following:

To Parents and Students:

- Development of workshops, a guide, and a booklet (Your Child and Testing) to provide easily understandable materials on testing in the schools.
- Development of a television series, "Freestyle," designed to reduce the limiting effects of sex-role stereotyping on the career aspirations of 9- to 12-year-old youngsters.
- Development of the Experience-Based Career Education Program, a model for integrating school and work experience for youth, in which some 22,000 students have participated.

To Teachers:

- A state-of-the-art review of effective elementary school teaching, the findings from which are summarized in the publication Time to Learn.
- Dissemination to classroom teachers of information on programs concerned with reading and instruction and mathematics through the publication series Research Within Reach.

To School Superintendents and School Administrators:

- Establishment of a forum for school superintendents from 21 cities to discuss solutions to problems critical to urban schools and affecting approximately 5 million students.
- Collaboration with the American Association of School Administrators in planning for R&D information for their Summer Instructional Leadership Project.
- Service to the 50 states through a regional program that promotes the exchange of research and development information.

To States:

- Assistance to 47 states in implementing, strengthening, and institutionalizing dissemination services.
- Technical assistance through the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL) to aid rural districts and states in assessing state policies and programs for rural education.

To Federal Policymakers:

- Active involvement with the Office for Civil Rights in the development of Federal policy on school desegregation.
- Development of a computer-assisted literacy program for Navy recruits for the Department of the Navy.
- Replication of the NIE-supported Career Intern Program in four cities for the Department of Labor.

To Congress:

- Conduct of a comprehensive study of the problems of violence and vandalism in schools.
- Conduct of a broad study of compensatory education programs instrumental for reauthorization of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
- Conduct of a study of vocational education that will bear on reauthorization of Federal vocational education legislation.

To State Legislators:

- Technical assistance, policy studies, and dissemination activities on school finance reform to assist legislators in 35 states.
- Sponsorship of the publications Law and Contemporary Problems and Increasing the Effectiveness of School Desegregation: Lessons from Research to provide understanding of the effects of school desegregation.

Researchers in the field also make their needs known through proposals submitted in response to announced competitions. Additionally, they are encouraged to originate unique ideas relevant to NIE's mission and to submit those ideas as unsolicited proposals. Proposals are reviewed not only by NIE staff but also by experts outside the Federal government in order to determine their relevance and quality. NIE is further aided in identifying research needs by examining trends that are revealed through assessments such as the NIE-supported National Assessment of Educational Progress.

The Institute believes that the best criteria for measuring the success of dissemination methods and the effectiveness of these needs assessments are: (1) the utility of products as expressed by the demand for publications, inquiries, and technical assistance; and (2) gains in solving perceived problems that can be attributed to changes brought about through research.

We believe that the Institute's outreach activities in assessing research needs have been very effective, as shown through the enthusiastic interest from educational audiences in NIE's publications such as research reports and guidebooks. Formal and informal communication with individual educational practitioners and representatives of professional associations has reinforced our belief that NIE's programs are focused on issues that are of primary concern to the educational community.

We have evidence that research can help people solve educational problems, and believe that NIE's data on effective schools and effective teaching has potentially dramatic implications for improving instruction in our schools.

82-374 O—81——8

11.

Q. How do the results of NIE sponsored research affect classroom practices? What efforts does NIE make to translate the research results into practical guidelines for teachers? What efforts does NIE make to ensure that this information gets to teachers and teacher trainers?

A. NIE uses a number of strategies to get the results of research projects into practice. Many of these have involved direct application of research results to classroom instruction. For example, one project studied the way in which children can manage their thinking and study skills. At the end of the project, the experimental materials were adopted as part of the school system's curriculum. As mentioned in NIE's earlier testimony, findings from another set of projects were presented directly to publishers in order to help them improve teachers' guides for reading instruction. Other projects have produced, in layman's-language, publications distributed through professional organizations or public information centers. These include Your Child and Testing, Research Within Reach, Linguistic Communication: Perspectives for Research, and publications on the use of hand-held calculators in mathematics instruction.

Another set of activities that translates the research results into guidelines or forms practical for teachers are the Information Analysis Products, prepared by the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) clearinghouses. Each of the 16 content-focused clearinghouses prepares syntheses, analyses, or collections of the research on an education topic of current concern to teachers. These short, easy-to-read documents are then made available nationwide through the ERIC system. Another useful research series aimed directly at classroom teachers is Theory and Research into Practice (TRIP), a series of nineteen books commissioned and published by the Reading and Communication Skills Clearinghouse, operated by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). The series has been well received. Examples of titles in that series include: Observing and Writing, Writing about Ourselves and Others, and Structuring Reading Activities for English Classes.

Other efforts NIE makes to ensure that information gets to teachers and teacher trainers include support for the Research and Development Exchange (RDx). This exchange, composed of projects in seven regional laboratories and supported by four system support projects, works with state departments of education to provide research-based information, training, and technical assistance for school improvement efforts. Each exchange serves its region as a central depository for information and products, provides referral services, and aids the spread of information about locally-produced exemplary practices and products.

NIE relies upon and works directly with professional associations of educators in order to disseminate research findings and their practical implications to teachers and teacher educators. For instance, a staff member from the Center for Social Organization of Schools writes a regular column for NEA's journal, Today's Education, in which recent research findings with implications and suggestions for classroom teachers are described. As another example, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education devoted an entire issue of their Journal of Teacher Education to a discussion and description of the findings and implications of research on teacher effectiveness. This special issue has been in continued high demand since its publication.

Although much of our work with teacher trainers has been disseminated through professional journals and conferences, which are the traditional means of circulating professional information among people working in this group, we believe that working even more directly with this group is valuable. In fact, we are currently planning some instructional improvement workshops with teachers, with the first scheduled for the summer of 1982.

Finally, we believe it will be helpful to describe in a bit more detail how results of several specific NIE research activities in various parts of the country have been used in classrooms, affecting both the classroom practice involved in the research and, through a ripple effect, becoming available to large numbers of other education practitioners.

A. Findings from research conducted at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (RDCTE) in Austin, Texas provide practical guidelines that teachers can use to organize and manage their classrooms in a way that results in increased student learning. These guidelines are contained in a manual entitled Organizing and Managing the Elementary School Classroom, which was used in a district-wide in-service training program in Austin. By reducing the amount of time spent on noninstructional activities, this program added the equivalent of 10 to 16 additional days of instructional time per school year. If the district had extended the length of the school year by this amount, rather than improve the use of existing time, the cost would have amounted to an additional $2-3 million. Training programs based upon this manual, as well as upon a similar manual for junior high-school classrooms, are now being used in a number of LEA's throughout the country.

Another project at RDCTE has focused on developing a model to improve the process by which research-based innovations such as curriculum packages, in-service training, and other changes are introduced into local education agencies and institutions of higher education. The project has worked with over 40 school systems, teacher education institutions, state departments of education, teacher centers, educational service agencies, and other groups across the nation in helping them understand and implement the model. RDCTE has also taken the lead in bringing together researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to collaborate in identifying ways by which research can best contribute to the understanding and improvement of practice in teacher education, particularly at the pre-service level. As an indication of widespread support for and interest in this initiative, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, which represents the vast majority of teacher education institutions in the U.S., chose the results of RDCTE's agenda-building process as the lead article in the March/April 1981 issue of their national journal.

B. An NIE-sponsored project at the Far West Laboratory pioneered efforts to make teachers equal partners in research and staff development. One such project in San Diego resulted in new research findings on how to reduce classroom disruptions and increase student learning time. These findings were immediately translated into a

staff development program for the San Diego schools, training teachers and others in effective ways of reducing classroom disruptions. This interactive research and development process itself has been adapted by the San Diego Unified School District, at its own expense, to aid in the implementation of a school desegregation program. This same process of involving teachers in research to improve classroom instruction is currently being adapted in schools, teacher centers, and a college of education in New York City, and by a Teacher Corps project in Lubbock, Texas.

C. Research conducted by the Center for Social Organization of Schools at Johns Hopkins University has resulted in the development of classroom organization practices which rely on the use of student learning teams. These teams have been shown to be highly effective in promoting student achievement and cooperation in classrooms. Through the provision of workshops and training materials, student team learning programs are now operating in classrooms in approximately 2,000 schools in every state of the nation. School districts which have used student team learning include: Columbia, South Carolina; Detroit; New Orleans; Prince Georges County, Maryland; and Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Central Greene, Connellsville, Uniontown, and Waynesburg, Pennsylvania.

D. Results of NIE-supported research suggest that inner-city schools can be effective in teaching poor and minority students, and that such effective schools have principals who are strong instructional leaders, professional staffs with high expectations for pupil performance and with agreed-upon instructional goals, safe and orderly school climates, and testing and assessment systems linked to their instructional goals. Findings from these research studies form the basis of a large number of state- and city-wide school improvement programs where principals and classroom teachers receive technical assistance on how to improve instructional practices. Such programs which rely on NIE-supported research are located, for example, in Pennsylvania, Delaware, California, Milwaukee (Wisconsin), and New York City.

E. The California Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES) findings regarding the crucial importance of increased time-on-task have been used by California educators to directly improve instruction; and the report Time to Learn, which discusses the findings and implications of the study, has been widely disseminated. Nearly 10,000 copies of the volume have been requested by staff developers, deans of colleges of education, teacher center staffs, principals, and state department of education personnel across the nation. As just one specific example of the book's impact, the Washington, D.C. schools announced that the research evidence and practical hints provided by the BTES served as a major stimulus for their decision to design a junior high-school program to increase mathematics and reading instructional time throughout the system.

12.

Q. What prior research, teaching and other educational experience does NIE look for in potential grantees (both organizations and individual researchers)? What other professional qualifications does NIE require of potential grantees?

A. The Institute does not stipulate any uniform professional qualifications for potential grantees. However, an applicant's qualifications and research experience, are indeed part of the criteria by which a research proposal is evaluated.

All applications for research grant support--small, major, or preapplication--are subject to a comprehensive external peer review process, followed by review within the Institute. Evaluation criteria for each grant program are clearly stated in each grant program regulation and subsequent program announcement. Thus, applicants know the criteria and generally have included more than adequate documentation on their qualifications in their respective grant applications.

For example, in the Teaching and Learning Research Grants Announcement, FY 81-84, one of the five criteria for evaluation of research proposals is:

> Qualifications of the principal investigator and other professional personnel, including such concerns as:
>
> (a) experience and previous research productivity;
>
> (b) quality of the discussion and analysis in the application;
>
> (c) evidence of awareness and sensitivity to the special concerns of any target population participating in the research;
>
> (d) evidence that the practical and research experience of the principal investigator(s) and others are appropriate for the topics, subjects and settings of the study.

Out of a possible 100 points for application evaluation, the qualifications of the applicant and other professional personnel may account for a maximum of 20 points.

13.

Q. Forty percent of the NIE budget supports its labs and centers. What mechanism does NIE use to initiate and monitor activities within these labs and centers?

A. For fiscal year 1981, 48 percent of NIE's budget is obligated to labs and centers. Under their long-term agreements with the Institute, these organizations are now in their second year of 3-year noncompetitive awards.

In dealing with centers, NIE staff collaborate with each center's staff, appropriate advisory groups, and representatives of target groups to determine the most significant needs to be addressed through that center's work. Each center then proposes a scope of work for NIE's review and approval.

Since the work of a laboratory must be regionally responsive to the needs of its region, NIE staff work with lab staffs to ensure that their governing boards are adequately representative, strong, and active, and that the boards--rather than lab staffs--are determining the regions' R&D priorities. Based on these priorities, the labs submit proposed scopes of work for NIE review and approval.

NIE monitors this work to ensure the proper expenditure of Federal monies on activities of demonstrated significance and conducts periodic peer reviews of the quality of work performed.

14.

Q. The regional educational laboratories were established to address educational concerns in given geographical areas. How do the labs determine priority concerns of their regions? To what extent are teachers, local educational administrators and other educators in the region involved in this process, in the research itself, and in the monitoring of the labs?

A. NIE has required that the labs use representative boards of directors and established needs assessment procedures to determine the priority concerns of their regions. Advisory boards are made up of: representatives from each state in a lab's region (legislators, Chief State School Officers, and other state education officials), school district representatives (superintendents and school board members), school and community representatives (principals, teachers, and parents), higher education representatives, and representatives from the business communities.

In their needs assessments, the labs use telephone interviews, mail surveys, and policy analyses with a wide range of clients in their regions. The results of these procedures are reviewed with their boards--which meet regularly to review the labs' needs assessment procedures and to set priorities for R&D work. Then, when priority needs are identified, the labs submit scopes of work to NIE for review and approval.

15.

Q. The research and development centers were established to address educational issues of national concern. How were these key issues determined? What system is used to ensure that these centers are meeting the national needs in their assigned fields? How is it determined that these issues are still current? What is the mechanism for phasing out centers whose issue areas are no longer relevant or crucial?

A. In 1972 the research and development centers were transferred to NIE from the Office of Education. During the subsequent years, Congressional set-asides in the Institute's appropriations created an environment of sheltered competition, which limited NIE's ability to redirect the research issues addressed by the centers.

To develop centers on critical issues that arose during the 1970's--for example, bilingual education reading and teaching--the Institute used the alternative of open competitions, in which awards were made to new organizations that are not a part of the network of 17 labs and centers. In 1979 a Congressionally-mandated panel recommended that the Institute enter into a long-term planning and strengthening relationship with the centers, in which their research missions could be strengthened and in some cases redirected. Each center now has a national advisory panel to provide guidance in the selection of research issues. Under the terms of the long-term relationship, each center would also undergo an intensive review of the priority and quality of its work during the third year of its grant. On the basis of this review NIE could renew the grants of centers doing high-quality work on high-priority issues, and it could request centers working on issues no longer relevant to current priorities to phase out their work.

16.

Q. Please provide us with a list of projects sponsored by NIE, indicating which were awarded through competition and which were awarded as sole-source grants or contracts. Please also indicate which were awarded to a regional education lab or research and demonstration center. Please provide also a separate list of the labs and centers with a description of the research they conduct, their contracts with NIE, the total amount of their current NIE funding and their status in terms of years funded and years remaining under present contracts.

A. Attached are: (1) National Institute of Education FY 1980 Awards, with sole-source awards asterisked; (2) a separate list of the 17 educational laboratories and centers and descriptions of each; and (3) a chart showing FY 1981 funding from NIE and from other sources.

For the past nine years, since they were transferred from OE to NIE in 1972, all 17 labs and centers have received noncompetitive awards from NIE. Except for the Center for Education Policy and Management (CEPM) and the Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individual Schooling (WRDCIS), each lab and center is now in the second year of a 3-year award ending November 30, 1982. (CEPM and WRDCIS are in the first year of 3-year awards ending November 30, 1983.)

Under NIE administrative policy for long-term relationships with these organizations, each lab and center is to undergo a third-year review. As a result of this review, NIE may: (1) make a new 3-year award, (2) strengthen the organization's work for a limited period of time with the possibility of a new 3-year award in the future, or (3) phase out a lab or center with low-quality or low-priority work.

Names and locations of the 17 Labs and Centers

July 30, 1981

Laboratories

Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL; located in Charleston, West Virginia; serves Alabama, Kentucky, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia)

CEMREL, Inc. (located in St. Louis; serves Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, and Wisconsin)

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (FWL; located in San Francisco; serves California, Nevada, and Utah)

Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL; located in Kansas City and Denver; serves Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming)

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL; located in Portland, Oregon; serves Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, the Trust Territories of the Pacific, and Washington)

Research for Better Schools (RBS; located in Philadelphia; serves Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania)

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL; located in Austin; serves Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas)

SWRL Educational Research and Development (SWRL; located in Los Alamitos, California; serves Arizona, California, and Nevada)

Centers

Center for Educational Policy and Management (CEPM; located at the University of Oregon), Eugene, Oregon 97401

Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE; located at the University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024)

Center for Social Organization of Schools (CSOS; located at Johns Hopkins University), Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance (IFG; located at Stanford University), Stanford, California 94305

Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC; located at the University of Pittsburgh), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS; independent; located in Boulder, Colorado 80302)

National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE; located at The Ohio State University) Columbus, Ohio 43210

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (RDCTE; located at the University of Texas, Austin 78712)

Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling (WRDCIS; located at the University of Wisconsin, Madison 53706)

July 30, 1981

Mission and Programmatic Focus of Each Lab and Center

Laboratories

AEL's mission is to improve education and educational opportunity for those who live in the laboratory's primarily nonurban region. The lab provides two major types of service: dissemination and short-term regional services, such as technical assistance in response to the immediate needs of the lab's constituency; and long-term (3-5 year) research and demonstration activities in specific substantive areas identified as high priority by the region's educators and citizens. At present the lab's long-term research is in basic skills, school-family relations, life-long learning for adults, and pupil behavior problems.

CEMREL's primary mission is to improve the effectiveness of instruction in its region's schools by the development and application of curricula and instructional systems based upon relevant research in the social and behavioral sciences; systematic instructional analysis by scholars in the major content areas; the application of systems analysis and planning to the development of curriculum, and the organization and management of instruction; careful assessment of individual learners and learning outcomes; and the use of new and promising instructional technology. With its NIE funds CEMREL conducts projects on mathematics, arts and humanities, urban education, training for women and minorities, teaching strategies, and dissemination.

FWL's mission is to contribute to improvement in the quality of learning experiences that support the values and functions of a humanistic society. FWL carries out this mission by conducting four types of activities: (1) the production of new knowledge through research; (2) programmatic development leading to new high-quality products or processes that will serve the needs of all learners, with particular attention to programs concerned with processes of quality teaching and learning, use of the outcomes of educational research and development, education as it relates to work, and education for a pluralistic society; (3) technical assistance in support of quality education for those who seek or need such service; and (4) the maintainance of an impartial environment where educational issues can be confronted and assessed.

McREL's mission is to improve educational practice in its region, with particular attention to those who traditionally have received a poorer quality of education than the general population. The primary beneficiaries of McREL's work are minorities, the handicapped, those in small, isolated, or rural schools, and women. To achieve this mission, McREL employs three strategies for increasing and improving the use by practitioners of research and experience-based knowledge: knowledge dissemination and utilization, the development of knowledge about educational practice in the region, and development of the capabilities of individuals and organizations in the region to receive and use knowledge for practice improvement.

NWREL's mission is to assist education, government, community agencies, business and labor in improving quality and equality in educational programs and processes by developing and disseminating effective educational products and procedures; conducting research on educational needs and problems; providing technical assistance in educational problem solving; evaluating effectiveness of educational programs and projects; providing training in educational planning, management, evaluation and instruction; and serving as an information resource on effective educational programs and processes. With its NIE funding the lab conducts projects on functional literacy, Indian reading and language studies, evaluation, applied performance testing, education and work, multi-cultural in-service training, training for women and minorities, rural education, regional research and development services, dissemination, competency-based education, and computer technology.

RBS's mission is to apply the results of educational research and development in improving elementary and secondary schools in its region. The lab works at the state and intermediate levels to provide information and training in the design and implementation of state-initiated school improvement programs. It works with local schools to build staff skills in planning, implementing, disseminating and evaluating improvement programs. In basic skills, the emphasis is on turning research into practical day-to-day procedures for increasing student reading and math achievement. In career preparation, schools and communities are assisted in building capability to help young people decide about careers. The Regional Exchange program supplies research-based information and technical assistance to state-initiated school improvement programs. Evaluation services offers assistance to agencies desiring to assess the effects of their programs, while Field Studies contributes to an understanding of how schools change and can be helped to improve.

SEDL's mission is to promote quality learning in its region by conducting research, developing educational products, and assisting other educational institutions. These activities address three broad goals: (1) meeting the educational needs of special populations, such as those with unique language or cultures, physical or mental exceptionality or functional competency; (2) understanding and studying the conditions that influence learning and schooling both in and out of the school setting; and (3) linking potential users, such as teachers or state departments of education, with tested cost-effective educational products or strategies.

SWRL's mission is to develop fundamental, significant improvements in education and to conduct educational research in order to solve the problems and to serve the needs of the public and private schools, colleges and universities in its region. With its NIE funding the lab conducts projects on operational quality and equality in education, basic skills instruction, bilingual-bicultural education, and participatory research and development.

Centers

CEPM's mission is the conduct, synthesis, and dissemination of research directed toward improving the performance of elementary and secondary schools through the use of policy and management tools. This center has recently sharpened its mission to focus more directly on the effects of administrative policies and management practices on the conduct of education. Much of its current effort is devoted to laying out the connections between policy, management, and outcomes. This effort requires review of the literature on student outcomes and instructional processes; on teacher behavior and how it is shaped by such immediate factors as curriculum, instructional technology, work resources, and incentives; on facets of organization and administration that shape those immediate factors; and on the broad setting of community preferences, governance, and professional expectations within which local education takes place. This intensive review will produce a research agenda for the Center, and should stimulate scholars elsewhere as well.

CSE's mission focuses on education testing and evaluation. Using diverse social science frameworks, CSE conducts research on the use of evaluation and testing information in educational settings from the pre-school through the university. CSE's goals include the identification of conditions under which evaluation and test information lead to improved educational programs and the generation of improved statistical and testing methods. Much of CSE's work in information use and educational improvement has focused on issues facing educators at the state and local levels. Recent CSE research concentrates on new and more valid ways of testing literacy and writing ability. Other research projects are studying such fundamental issues as fairness and validity of tests and the costs and benefits of testing and evaluation programs at the federal, state and local levels. A program of basic research to pinpoint indicators of school effectiveness is currently under development.

CSOS's mission is to produce useful knowledge on how changes in the structure and organization of schools influence student learning, attitudes, and success in adult roles. To carry out its mission, the center is organized into four programs, each of which focuses on a specific class of outcomes and a particular level of educational organization. The School Organization Program studies variation in the structure of classrooms and schools and their effects on immediate student outcomes, such as academic achievement and aspirations. The School Processes/Career Development Program examines schools and school systems and their effects on long-term student outcomes, such as higher education, careers, and job satisfaction. The School Desegregation Program studies school organization in relation to immediate outcomes (positive student relations minority academic achievement) and long-term consequences (social mobility of minorities). The Delinquency and School Environment Program examines the relationship of the social organization of schools and in-school and later life delinquency. Another program brings in young women and minority researchers for a year of collegial work with the Center's research staff.

IFG's mission focuses on the origins, implementation and consequences of different finance and governance arrangements in the educational sector. The center conducts basic and applied research on the fiscal, political, legal and organizational processes of elementary, secondary and postsecondary education in the public and private sectors. In particular, the equity and efficiency implications of various finance and governance arrangements are addressed through programs on catagorical grants in education, alternative structures of governance, and law and education. The center provides information to a wide audience of federal, state and local practitioners and policy makers on such topics as financing special education, the impact of tax and expenditure limitations on educational services, the consolidation of federal grants, bi-lingual education programs, and tuition tax credits.

LRDC's research addresses two topics: the processes of learning and the processes of schooling. Pervading both lines of work is a common theme, a concern with understanding how knowledge and skill are acquired in various school content areas. Research on the processes of learning focuses on understanding the nature and development of expertis within and across school subject matter areas, including reading, mathematics, science, and general learning skills. Research on the processes of schooling is concerned with understanding the contexts within which school learning occurs, that is, the ways in which school and family variables influence the learning process. The work on schooling includes three sets of activities: a program of research on social learning, a program of research on how natural variations in schooling processes affect learning, and the development and testing of an educational model which puts into practice the center's ideas about facilitating learning.

NCHEMS's mission is to improve planning and management in colleges, universities, and state agencies of higher education through research, development, and assistance activities. The center is organized into five programs. The Planning and Financing Program is developing methods of strategic planning for institutions to use in the current environment of declining resources, as well as conducting research on new state funding formulas that are based on principles of marginal cost. The Information for Management Program is developing a series of indicators of the status of higher education in such areas as the costs to students of going to college, student retention and academic preparedness, student participation in different types of postsecondary education, and the state financing of higher education. Organizational Studies is a new program of basic research on decision-making processes in institutions of post-secondary education. The Management Development program provides training for administrators in management techniques and leadership through a summer institute and through shorter seminars. The National Resources Program complements these program activities through providing resources for visiting scholars and interns, and for planning and evaluating the center's programs.

NCRVE is conducting a four-year research program on employability that will describe and analyze the various sectors of society that prepare youth for employment. The purpose is to arrive at recommendations on how to efficiently and equitably assist youth in developing employability competencies. The research is organized into three projects: (1) study of linkages between educators and employers that is focused on how well educational goals match employment requirements; (2) study of factors that consistently place some youth at high risk of school failure and persistent unemployment; and (3) study of approaches to assessing and documenting the employment competencies of youth. A final project is the Resource and Referral Service, which is developing a database of available educational information resources.

RDCTE's mission is to conduct research and related activities in close collaboration with practitioners, policy-makers, and researchers at all levels in the field of teacher education. The center aims to increase the validated knowledge bases underlying effective teaching and learning and successful implementation of research-based practices in a variety of settings. Specific research initiatives are focused on areas of major concern to practitioners in public schools and colleges. The center's projects include research designed to increase knowledge bases regarding the effects of various kinds of teachers and teaching on various important dimensions of learning by students with different backgrounds, characteristics and previous achievements; research on the effects of teacher education programs and practices on teachers; and research on the support and delivery systems required to assure high quality implementation of research-validated practices by teachers and teacher educators who have differing concerns, characteristics, previous experience and current perspectives.

WRDCIS has redefined its mission to focus on student diversity and the implications of diversity for schooling. Moving beyond an earlier focus on individual psychological differences and the individualization of teaching to respond to them, the center is now exploring the major dimensions along which students differ and which are important to teaching and school management. Research programs deal with differences in student learning and development, especially development of language proficiencies and other basic skills; differences in the response of students to various classroom processes and teaching techniques; differences in students which require schools to manage and allocate resources to meet the needs of various groups; and differences in students which result in Federal, state, or local mandates to provide specialized services, often compounding the demands on local classrooms. The center's goal is to locate those differences among students which are most important to education, and to explain how those differences can be met most efficiently and effectively by local schools.

Funding July 30, 19

Approximately one-third of NIE's total annual budget (over 40% of its program budget) has been awarded to the labs and centers over the past few years. As a result of Congressional mandates, the stability provided by the new policy, favorable reviews, and inflationary increases in costs, the total amount awarded to the labs and centers has steadily increased over the past five years in spite of the fact that the Institute's budget has declined:

	Amt. Awarded to Labs & Centers
FY 77	$25.6 million
FY 78	$28.0 million
FY 79	$29.6 million
FY 80	$30.6 million
FY 81	$30.9 million*

In the current fiscal year, the labs' and centers' total funding (from all sources) is $ 62,340,414. Of this, $51,456,114(83%) comes from the federal government, and $32,986,592* (53%) comes from NIE.

Institution	Total FY 81 Funds	Total Funds from Fed. Govt.	% of Total	Total Funds from NIE	% of Total
AEL	1,907,443	1,825,153	96 %	1,820,322	95 %
CEMREL	6,072,140	3,057,465	50.4%	2,759,669	45.4%
CEPM	884,055	884,055	100 %	884,055	100 %
CSE	1,075,000	975,000	90.7%	975,000	90.7%
CSOS	1,952,609	1,908,278	97 %	1,356,000	69 %
FWL	8,125,381	7,706,471	95 %	3,837,600	47 %
IFG	1,300,000	1,300,000	100 %	1,300,000	100 %
LRDC	3,999,021	3,597,997	90.1%	2,627,067	65.8%
McREL	1,228,000	877,785	71.5%	877,785	71.5%
NCHEMS	2,650,000	1,945,000	73 %	1,625,000	60 %
NCRVE	8,867,000	7,629,000	86 %	1,020,000	11.5%
NMREL	9,361,900	7,028,000	75.1%	3,521,600	37.6%
RBS	3,481,855	3,214,000	92.3%	2,607,000	74.9%
RDCTE	1,687,000	1,575,000	93 %	1,575,000	93 %
SEDL	2,700,000	2,467,000	91.4%	2,013,344	74.6%
SWRL	4,567,000	3,333,910	73 %	2,055,150	45 %
NRDCIS	2,482,000	2,132,000	85.9%	2,132,000	85.9%
TOTALS	62,340,414	$1,456,114	87.5%	32,986,592*	52.9%

* The FY 81 total listed at the top of the page ($30.9 million) includes only funds awarded under the long-term agreements. The total NIE funding listed at the bottom of the page ($32,986,592) includes all NIE funding, including monies won in competitions and awarded through separate contracts or grants.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

FY 1980 AWARDS

The National Institute of Education (NIE), established by the Congress in 1972, is the principal Federal agency supporting and conducting educational research. Its purpose is to advance the frontier of knowledge about the processes of teaching and learning and about all aspects of the educational system.

NIE has organized its work around three broad program areas: Teaching and Learning, Educational Policy and Organization, and Dissemination and Improvement of Practice. The descriptions of NIE's FY 80 awards in those three program areas and other cross-Institute awards follow.

PAGE NUMBER	FUNDING AREA	AMOUNT OBLIGATED THROUGH 9/30/80
1	TEACHING AND LEARNING	$37,979,535
25	EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND ORGANIZATION	12,115,890
38	DISSEMINATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PRACTICE	22,872,203
50	OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR	657,586
51	UNSOLICITED PROPOSAL PROGRAM	(3,213,861)
58	EDUCATIONAL LABORATORIES AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS	(30,607,913)
	TOTAL	$73,625,214

Budget and Program Analysis Division
Office of Administration, Management, and Budget

*Sole-source awards are asterisked.

TEACHING AND LEARNING (T&L)

- GENERAL

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
*American Psychological Association Washington, DC	$ 250,000	4/80 - 4/82	400800009	Support for postdoctoral fellows to engage in research in education and related disciplines.
Bank Street College of Education New York, NY	80,764	9/80 - 6/81	400800023	To examine the implementation and impact of microprocessing technology in schools.
University of Delaware Newark, DE	1,200	9/79 - 8/80	NIEG790124	Gathering data on types of children's groups in and out of classrooms, with a focus on children's social learning in school settings.
Ohio University Athens, OH	28,682	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG800164	The purpose of this research is to study the changing meanings of literacy in the United States from 1700 to the present.
NIE/National Science Foundation Bethesda, MD	250,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEIA80011	Interagency agreement for support of a joint NIE/NSF grants program studying mathematics and science learning processes.
Various individuals	323,386	Various	Various	Preparation of planning papers and reports, reviews of grant applications, and other miscellaneous small procurements for existing or proposed projects related to the T&L mission.
National Institute for Community Development Rosslyn, VA	161,016	9/79 - 8/80	400760036	Contractor provided technical assistance for: T&L Research Grants Program; and planning and management of conferences, workshops, task force, etc.
Dingle Associates Washington, DC	72,986	9/79 - 9/80	400790035	To provide research support for grants seminars, planning conferences, study group meetings, and report preparation.

- READING AND LANGUAGE STUDIES

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Michigan State University East Lansing, MI	$ 14,990	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800056	To compare both Spanish and English language use by Mexican-American adults enrolled in an adult basic education program.
Stanford University Stanford, CA	40,335	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800156	The National Study of Secondary School Writing is examing the teaching of writing in all subject areas in secondary schools.
Dr. Elsa J. Bartlett New York, NY	20,087	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800059	This research investigates development of skill in organizing narrative texts in good and poor elementary and junior high-school writers.
University of Hawaii Manoa, HI	13,665	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800087	To conduct research on language use of three- and four-year-old children in metropolitan Honolulu.
University of California Berkeley, CA	33,040	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800125	To compare written and spoken language differences.
University of South Carolina Columbia, SC	43,400	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800175	This project investigates the complex process of reading comprehension. A clearer understanding of factors involved in reading comprehension will be useful in more effective teaching of reading.
Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ	40,912	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800157	The proposed work investigates bilingual subjects' accuracy and speed in solving deductive reasoning problems in Spanish and English.
University of Texas Austin, TX	14,264	6/80 - 5/81	NIEG800054	To examine the editorial decision-making processes of experienced and inexperienced writers. Results should help teachers become more aware that effective revision strategies cannot be taught through a simple list of do's and don'ts focusing on usage and print convention.
Boston University Boston, MA	14,947	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800058	Project is designed to: (1) help identify students at risk for reading failure, (2) provide teachers with valid and practical phonics principles to help students sound out polysyllabic words, and (3) contribute to a theoretical understanding and practical approaches to understanding reading failure in the inner city.

82-874 O—81——9

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of Arizona Tucson, AZ	$ 14,783	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG800057	The project will conduct a secondary analysis of a data base on responses of children from several linguistic populations to a number of story readings. The research will contribute to knowledge of how children understand or misunderstand reading texts.
Indiana University Foundation Bloomington, IN	52,285	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG800121	Research is designed to analyze the growth of written language among preschool and primary-grade children by identifying the specific characteristics that influence children's development of written language literacy.
Temple University Philadelphia, PA	30,153	9/80 - 1/81	NIEG800163	The aim of the research is to compare speech and writing.
University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI	40,344	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800148	The proposed research is a classroom-based instructional program designed to measure and promote children's reading comprehension skills.
Cherokee Education Center, Inc. Tahlequah, OK	15,000	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800120	The purpose of this study is to identify the developmental stages of oral language acquisition of Cherokee children.
Center for Applied Linguistics Arlington, VA	19,703	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800122	This study will examine the nature of a unique "dialogue journal" which was developed and used by a classroom teacher for over ten years.
New Mexico State University Las Cruces, NM	50,761	7/80 - 7/83	NIEG800124	The purpose of this study is to develop techniques for analyzing the comprehensibility of Spanish-language texts which will permit a comparison of Spanish and English materials used in bilingual education programs.
University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA	29,505	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800182	This project studies the effects of different pedagogical techniques on reading acquisition.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of Colorado Boulder, CO	$ 19,119	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG780172	Development of a model of text comprehension which can help to increase understanding of why some texts are easy to read and others are hard.
University of Georgia Athens, GA	29,918	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG780054	Research on how well children comprehend what they read and how long they remember it.
Kent State University Kent, OH	50,000	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG780223	Project to develop a more accurate means of identifying processes of reading comprehension in children as well as adults.
University of Denver Denver, CO	40,000	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG780173	Research on the development of comprehension skills in the middle grades.
University of Wisconsin Madison, WI	26,314	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG780052	Research to test a theory of how children learn to understand written texts.
University of Kansas Lawrence, KS	66,000	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG780179	Basic research on the perceptual and conceptual skills related to reading for comprehension at the elementary, secondary, and college levels.
University of New Hampshire Durham, NH	39,990	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG780174	Research on the development of the composing and spelling process in primary children.
State University of New York Buffalo, NY	54,924	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG780224	Research on writing skills needed in business firms and other agencies.
University of Illinois Urbana, IL	1,710,000	10/80 - 9/81	400760116	The Center for the Study of Reading conducts research on reading comprehension, focusing on the transition from early reading to the stage where comprehension and retention are required and seeking ways to ease students' transition into more intellectually demanding reading tasks of the middle grades.
University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education Austin, TX	209,137	9/80 - 9/81	400780060	Study of literacy development in selected community colleges in Texas.
Arizona State University Tempe, AZ	211,439	9/80 - 9/81	400780061	Study of literacy development in selected community colleges in Arizona.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Carnegie-Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA	$ 63,627	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG780195	Research on learning and the writing process in adults.
Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN	43,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790117	Research to pinpoint effective ways for children to comprehend written information.
University of Arizona Tucson, AZ	23,997	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790167	Research to get a better understanding of the difficulties students have with textbooks.
University of New Mexico Albuquerque, NM	59,971	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790179	Research directed at improving the teaching of literacy for poor and minority populations.
Texas Christian University Fort Worth, TX	46,234	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790157	Research to determine the extent that outline format headings help students learn science text.
University of Illinois Urbana, IL	31,153	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG790136	Research to determine how people of varying literacy skills cope with activities in different social settings in daily life.
University of California La Jolla, CA	65,000	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG790135	Research on how preschoolers deal with written material.
University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI	50,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790133	Research to better understand the roles of the writer and the reader in order to improve comprehension in stories, essays, etc.
University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, IN	53,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790134	Research on the more complex aspects of memory and their relation to the acquisition of reading skills.
Yeshiva University New York, NY	53,980	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790122	Research to better understand factors that influence the acquisition of literacy skills.
University of California Berkeley, CA	47,284	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790121	Research to discover the specific skills tested by tests of reading comprehension.
Carnegie-Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA	68,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790119	Research on the psychological process underlying reading comprehension.
University of California Berkeley, CA	74,998	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790118	Research to study extent to which different factors account for how quickly and efficiently young children learn a second language.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Inter-American Research Associates Rosslyn, VA	$ 287,626	7/80 - 9/81	400790042	Fundamental research on language proficiency testing and professional development for teachers to improve assessment practices.
California State University Sacramento, CA	137,821	8/80 - 9/81	400790077	The study is examining an exemplary bilingual education program and identifying the significant characteristics of that school system and community.
Stanford University Stanford, CA	59,458	10/79 - 9/80	NIEG790138	The study focuses on bilingual linguistic competence as it relates to pupils' language dominance and school achievement.
American Institutes for Research Washington, DC	550,000	11/79 - 2/81	400780043	The Document Design Project should produce knowledge and techniques that will be useful in: (1) providing training in document design for students ranging from the high-school level to the doctoral level, according to their needs and the intended uses of their training; (2) building theories of human information processing that are specific to functionally important reading and writing tasks that people frequently perform in school, on the job, and during routine daily activities; and (3) improving the design of certain important documents published in the public and private sector.
Stanford University Stanford, CA	29,982	4/80 - 9/80	NIEG800040	Study of linguistic knowledge of nonreaders compared to readers among monolingual and bilingual adults.
*Haskins Laboratories New Haven, CT	15,000	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800178	Project will perform research in the various reading and writing processes in deaf adults.
Northwestern University Evanston, IL	29,984	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800176	This project will study children's knowledge about written language at the time they are beginning to read.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
ARC Associates Oakland, CA	147,102	6/80 - 5/81	400800013	This study is focusing on a Chinese community on the West Coast. It will accomplish the three tasks: (1) to identify an exemplary bilingual program to be studied, (2) conduct an ethnographic study of community and school interactions, and (3) conduct a sociolinguistic study of the languages and dialects used in the school, home, and community.
Inter America Arlington, VA	672,900	9/80 - 9/81	400800040	This project supports the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, which collects, analyzes, and disseminates information on bilingual education. The Clearinghouse does this through: (1) coordination and cooperation with Title VII Center Networks, (2) development of a computerized data file on information in bilingual education not available in ERIC and other data bases, (3) provision of information services to bilingual educators including a monthly newsletter and a toll-free hotline for reference and referral, (4) conduct of an information needs assessment for the bilingual education community, and (5) technical assistance.
Dine Biolta Association Window Rock, AZ	3,442	6/80 - 5/82	400800012	This project will examine perceptions of various segments of the community which impact on bilingual education programs.

* LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of Chicago Chicago, IL	$ 22,487	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800099	Data regarding individual children's limits on counting and numeration tasks have raised a number of interesting questions about development of these skills and links among them. Project will gather similar data to record the year-long arithmetic experience of these students and to follow up for another year the laboratory school group.
State University of New York Buffalo, NY	23,589	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800097	The study will describe the movement toward conceptual maturity on arithmetic tasks of three groups of thirty students which will reflect a cross-section of the population from a large metropolitan school district.
University of Texas Austin, TX	50,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800143	This project will examine individual patterns in the development of number concepts in 3- to 6-year-old children.
St. Francis College Brooklyn, NY	7,543	9/80 - 4/81	NIEG800093	Support of research on graph comprehension of students, and investigation of students' ability to comprehend the mathematical relationships expressed in graphs and whether this effect is over and beyond that of reading performance and mathematics achievement.
University of Illinois Urbana, IL	31,888	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG800098	This project will examine the process by which students develop key ideas involving fractions.
Harvard University Cambridge, MA	21,331	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800094	Children's understanding of numerals and the numeration system undergoes change, and these changes are related to their cognitive development. Very young children have their own ideas about what numerals mean, and these ideas are related to their developing notions of the number itself. This project will examine these ideas in relationship to present and future teaching methods.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of California Santa Barbara, CA	$ 32,156	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800095	This project examines differences in the ways sixth-grade boys and girls solve arithmetic story problems. Knowledge of the strategies and the cognitive processes used by boys and girls will help teachers plan both basic and remedial instruction.
University of California Santa Barbara, CA	25,773	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800118	This project will examine how novices learn to become creative users of electronic computers and will contribute to what Schneiderman (1980) calls "software psychology"--a theory of how humans think about and use computers.
Northern Arizona University Flagstaff, AZ	14,015	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800100	This study will attempt to identify those elements in the language or cultural background of native American undergraduate students that may inhibit their effective learning of mathematics concepts.
University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA	33,611	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800126	Project will conduct a series of studies to investigate effects of text comprehensibility upon the acquisition and use of elementary probability theory. Text comprehensibility is derived from a network representation of probability results, concepts, and examples. Hypotheses about processing of mathematical knowledge will be tested.
University of Alaska Fairbanks, AK	14,505	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800092	To begin an interdisciplinary research effort into the nature of mathematics teaching and learning across cultures, this study will identify educational and social processes best suited to increase the integration of mathematical thinking into the social and cultural circumstances of the learner.
University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA	21,033	6/80 - 1/81	NIEG800096	Project will design a conceptual framework for representing knowledge of high-school mathematics. The framework will help teachers not only organize and present a topic, but also assess students' understanding of it.
City University of New York New York, NY	46,136	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800119	To study how the development of numerational concepts in children is affected by differences in both language background and the style of mother-child interaction in problem-solving settings.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA	26,069	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800144	This study will examine the influence of semantics in solving multiplication and division word problems.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of Iowa Iowa City, IA	$ 28,655	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800091	This research will examine the bases of children's problems in extending math concepts to applied settings.
University of Maryland Baltimore, MD	46,100	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG780163	Research will identify intellectual factors underlying children's difficulties in learning mathematics.
University of Iowa Iowa City, IA	28,990	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG780178	This project will examine students' understanding of place-value notations in mathematics.
University of California Irvine, CA	50,940	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG780194	Research on the use of arithmetic in the daily lives of adults.
University of Florida Gainesville, FL	46,400	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG780225	Research on successful problem-solving in geometry.
University of Chicago Chicago, IL	49,908	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG790090	The study will assess differences in cognitive development of secondary-school geometry students and determine the effect of those differences on geometry achievement.
University of New Orleans New Orleans, LA	39,531	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG790092	This research will examine children's ability to transform figurative information into qualitatively different information.
Institute of Black Studies, Inc. St. Louis, MO	43,400	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG790093	This project will identify and examine those factors and variables that are related to mathematics learning among black Americans.
University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA	54,800	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG790094	The project will compare bilingual and monolingual students' preconceptions, misconceptions, and problem-solving abilities in mathematics.
Rutgers University New Brunswick, NJ	53,692	6/80 - 9/81	NIEG790109	The project will study over time the factors affecting college students' decisions on course enrollment, major choice, and career aspirations in math, science, and engineering.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Policy Research and Planning Group Chapel Hill, NC	$ 23,479	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG790108	Project will examine the process by which peer groups influence the choice of math/science college majors of black and white women at two universities.
University of Wisconsin Madison, WI	49,844	9/80 - 6/81	NIEG790110	Research on the school-related characteristics and processes that are linked to participation of black females in scientific and mathematical pursuits.
University of Arizona Tucson, AZ	59,185	6/80 - 9/81	NIEG790111	Research to identify the social factors which hinder or facilitate Mexican-American women's participation in science courses and careers.
Consulting Statisticians, Inc. Burlington, MA	112,033	6/80 - 6/81	400790066	Research on how people construct, perceive, and comprehend presentation of information through graphs, charts, and figures.
Northwestern University Evanston, IL	44,559	6/80 - 9/81	NIEG790114	This project is investigating the role modeling processes that contribute to the problems that female mathematics students face in higher education.
Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, MD	34,154	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790113	This project investigates the social experiences related to the development of interest, self-confidence, and competence in mathematics among adolescent girls who have been identified as having superior mathematical ability.
Morris Brown College Atlanta, GA	48,788	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG790116	A study of representative high schools and colleges in the southeast U.S. to identify factors which influence black women students to continue in or drop out of science courses.
Mississippi State University Mississippi State, MS	30,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790159	The purpose of this project is to discover how perceptions of sex role and self-concept of adolescent girls are formed relative to science and technology in classroom social interactions, and to determine the influence of these variables upon girls' achievements and attitudes toward science.
University of Wisconsin Madison, WI	45,546	6/80 - 9/81	NIEG790112	This project is examining the development of and influences on sex-related differences in students' confidence in learning mathematics.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc. Cambridge, MA	$ 130,317	9/80 - 9/81	400800031	To examine existing cognitive skills training, review appropriate cognitive science research, conduct research, and synthesize all findings.
*Biospherics, Inc. Rockville, MD	21,646	3/80 - 8/80	400800010	To provide funds for the completion of all editing, graphics, layout, and production of camera-ready copies of three conference compendia.
Ohio State University Columbus, OH	49,825	3/80 - 3/81	400800007	The purpose of this project is to establish the Calculator Information Center. This center is to collect and disseminate information on hand-held calculator usage in school mathematics to a variety of audiences.
Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ	128,187	9/80 - 9/81	400800032	The purpose of this project is to conduct research on sex equity in classroom interactions.
Network of Innovative Schools, Inc. Andover, MA	86,531	9/80 - 9/81	400800033	The purpose of this study is to see how different teachers, who consciously are trying to achieve sex equity in their classroom style, are dealing with such questions.
University of Illinois Urbana, IL	109,918	8/80 - 10/81	NIECB00133	This project supports four interrelated activities in studying mathematics curricula: (1) operation of the International Mathematics Committee, (2) the U.S. National Mathematics Committee, (3) data collection and analysis in the U.S., and (4) the U.S. National Coordinating Center.
*University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA	173,544	1/80 - 12/81	NIECB00002	This award supports an ethnographic research study of children's learning in and out of schools by the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education and involves students in a number of Philadelphia District One schools.
Center for Applied Linguistics Arlington, VA	6,706	8/80 - 7/81	NIECB00133	The study will provide a data base and a descriptive analysis of the representative stages of language acquisition found among black children from working class families.

- EDUCATION IN THE HOME, COMMUNITY, AND WORK

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of California San Diego, CA	$ 67,203	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800062	This study will provide a detailed description of the role which literacy plays in the non-school and school environments of lower-class black, Anglo, and Chicano children aged five to nine. Such descriptions will be useful for effective educational planning.
Harvard University Cambridge, MA	57,231	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800086	This study will analyze the contribution of out-of-school experiences to the development of intermediate-grade literacy skills among low-income children who are either low- or high-reading achievers in second, fourth, and sixth grades.
University of Rochester Rochester, NY	13,910	7/80 - 12/80	NIEG800052	This study will review the intersection of formal education with training; the accessibility of training to minority groups, women, and youth; and implications regarding the improvement of lifelong learning and productivity.
South Asian American Education Association Stockton, CA	64,144	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG800123	This study describes and documents the range of problems which Punjabi (south Asian) youth encounter in school, investigates within the larger community context the causes of these problems, and points to possible strategies for reducing existing barriers to educational equity.
University of Delaware Newark, DE	11,991	7/80 - 7/81	NIEG800128	This study, using data already collected in 1979-80 in a junior high school, will examine the social patterns and social referents for a sample of black junior high-school students involved in reading activities in school and non-school settings.
Center for Applied Linguistics Arlington, VA	28,982	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800132	This study will describe and analyze learning events occurring in homes of a sample of middle-class and lower Puerto Rican kindergarten-aged children in a town in Puerto Rico.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Minneapolis Public Schools Minneapolis, MN	$ 15,000	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800065	Sixty-four urban Indian students will be the subjects of this study in which Indian researchers will examine the Indian students who succeed in the public schools. The study will attempt to discover patterns of external and internal support structures important to those Indian students who succeed. Research will also examine the world views and the strategies employed by successful Indian students in dealing with their family backgrounds and schools.
University of Utah Salt Lake City, UT	29,990	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800060	This project will use ethnographic methods to study how cognitive skills acquired in a complex real-life activity generalize beyond the specific requirements of that activity to other contexts and activities.
Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc. Charleston, WV	25,000	6/78 - 11/79	NIEG780201	To provide support for educational research project on early childhood and parenting.
University of Vermont Burlington, VT	42,000	9/80 - 6/81	NIEG790146	This project is studying learning projects and self-planned learning efforts among undereducated adults in rural Vermont.
Verbal Interaction Project, Inc. Freeport, NY	62,124	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800042	The investigation will attempt to identify, in three successive annual follow-up studies, the influence of mothers' preschool parenting skills on the children's school-related competencies at elementary-school age.
*University of California Los Angeles, CA	66,259	2/80 - 1/81	NIEG800016	This research is an investigation of the communicative competence of Caucasian and Afro-American mildly retarded adults living in the community.

82-774 O—81—10

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Harvard University Boston, MA	76,192	3/80 - 2/81	NIEG770049	Research to study how well adolescents are prepared for careers and their ability to change careers in later life.
University of Alaska Fairbanks, AK	76,500	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790153	A comparative study of three major organizations and schools as educational environments. This research will examine the potential of non-formal education for minority youth.
University of California Los Angeles, CA	59,282	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790172	This project will examine the comparative ability of radio and television to stimulate the imagination of and to transmit information to elementary school-age children of different ages, races, and social class backgrounds.
Teachers College Columbia University New York, NY	71,251	3/81 - 3/82	400790046	Research to study the role of the family in promoting children's acquisition of literacy skills learning during upper elementary-school ages.
Cornell University Ithaca, NY	150,000	9/80 - 9/81	400760150	Experimental study on effectiveness of family and neighborhood to build initiative, cooperation, and other positive attributes in children.
University of California Irvine, CA	40,000	4/80 - 11/80	NIEG790148	A comprehensive assessment of the effects of work on adolescent development. Results of this study will be used to assess costs and benefits of part-time work as a supplement to formal education.
Center for New Schools Chicago, IL	77,411	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790147	Ethnographic methods are being used to develop and test a typology of relationships between social context features of experiential learning environments and the cognitive demands of those environments.
University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN	103,564	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790180	Project is studying the relationship of non-formal adult learning to adult problem solving.

• TEACHING AND INSTRUCTION

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of California Berkeley, CA	$ 194,856	9/80 - 9/81	400800024	This study will focus on research on the characteristics of effective writing in inner-city secondary schools. The purposes of this project are: (1) to identify, describe, and analyze the conditions, procedures, and outcomes of instruction that are effective in different contexts; and (2) to use the study's results to improve the effectiveness of writing instruction in inner-city secondary schools.
*Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ	439,952	10/79 - 9/80	400780065	A longitudinal project designed to examine the cost of computer-assisted instruction with respect to its effectiveness as a teaching device.
Simon Fraser University Burnaby, British Columbia Canada	21,202	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790098	Children learn (or don't) to "psych out" teachers' learning styles. This study is examining the relation between children's own learning styles and the development of their ability to identify and use differential teacher instructional styles.
TDR Associates Newton, MA	65,802	9/80 - 9/81	400790076	Study of congruities and incongruities between school and home and effects on in-school learning in five different racial-ethnic groups. Findings should contribute to improvement of instructional practice and parent/school relations.
University of California La Jolla, CA	169,788	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG780159	Research will attempt to determine how organizing the classroom differently affects learning.
California State University Long Beach, CA	32,298	5/80 - 9/80	NIEG780161	Study will examine differences between pupils in how quickly and effectively they adjust to communicating in a new classroom.
University of Chicago Chicago, IL	201,241	12/80 - 12/81	400770094	To increase our understanding of the ways in which school systems, schools, and classrooms organize, allocate, distribute, and utilize educational resources.
Harvard University Cambridge, MA	10,000	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG780099	This research will provide basic knowledge about the cultural organization of interaction in Spanish-English bilingual classrooms.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
New York University New York, NY	$ 14,916	9/80 - 6/81	NIEG800069	Project will study the impact of handicapped children on low- and moderate-income non-handicapped classmates and on the regular classroom teachers' instruction.
University of Rhode Island Providence, RI	20,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800074	This study will test the validity of a conceptual model of a multifaceted motivational variable called the students' sense of efficacy in the classroom.
Center for Applied Linguistics Arlington, VA	48,149	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800072	Overall goal is to provide a data base and descriptive analysis of the nature of language usage in elementary school classrooms in which language diversity is a factor.
University of California San Diego, CA	40,020	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800155	This two-year project seeks to directly study the participant interactions that make up learning structures designed to promote the development of bilingual discourse skills.
University of California San Diego, CA	60,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800154	This effort is aimed at identifying key concepts and theoretical framework for interpreting reward system impacts on teacher task performance and the influence of that system through administrative behavior.
University of Alaska Fairbanks, AK	14,865	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800064	This project will demonstrate how cultural differences can be accommodated into education practices in the classroom, allowing maximum education opportunity for each student.
Texas Christian University Fort Worth, TX	14,079	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800067	This research will investigate the relationships among instructional grouping techniques in elementary school classrooms, the formation of friendship groupings among students in these classrooms, and the effects these two organizational features of classrooms have on the instructional work and outcomes of students. Information will be gathered on approximately 250 students of diverse ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds.
University of Kentucky Lexington, KY	30,143	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG800066	Primary objective of this project is to synthesize data from an ethnographic study of an elementary school with a bilingual program.
University of California Los Angeles, CA	14,813	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800068	The purpose of this study is to better understand the nature of interaction among students and between teachers and students in varied group settings in junior-high classrooms and to relate interaction to student learning.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Michigan State University East Lansing, MI	$ 900,000	1/80 - 9/80	400760073	Research focusing on understanding teaching as a cognitive process, thereby improving the quality of teaching and teacher preparation, both in-service and pre-service.
Michigan State University East Lansing, MI	47,487	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800073	The purposes of the study are: (1) to describe four kinds of student responses to classroom instruction: attention, level of success on daily assignments, self-initiative, and perceptions of how and why they do classroom tasks; and (2) to relate those responses to characteristics of the instruction that immediately preceded them. Six first-grade classes in lower socioeconomic schools will be observed during reading and language instruction.
James Block Santa Barbara, CA	15,000	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG800070	Play and its dialectic with work will be examined by this study to contribute to ensure more equality and excellence in learning outcomes for many more students.
University of California San Diego, CA	14,964	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800063	Project will investigate the linguistic, social, and cognitive skills of language-impaired children in an educational environment. Aim is to specify the skills of these children in social, problem-solving situations and to examine the dimensions of the learning environments that influence their performance.
Stanford University Stanford, CA	75,000	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800127	This study will examine the relationship between management and control of the classroom and learning of math and science concepts in culturally and linguistically distinctive children in order to know how to better implement complex curricula.
Des Moines Public Schools Des Moines, IA	15,000	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800065	A study to examine how five contextual factors (grade level, subject area, instructional format, time period, and school-wide expectation) and two aptitude factors (student type and teaching style) affect student academic engagement.
University of California Berkeley, CA	74,371	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800071	Research focuses on students' perceptions of processes within school and home environments which communicate academic expectations and ultimately influence achievement.
Southwest Educational Development Lab (SEDL) Austin, TX	27,000	9/80 - 9/81	400800035	This project is a collaborative research effort between SEDL and the San Marcos Consolidated Independent School District (SMCISD) designed to improve plans for in-service teacher education in San Marcos.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, MO	$ 50,178	3/80 - 9/80	400790051	The purpose of this study is to examine and explain the processes and patterns of daily interaction, the roles and relationships, and the career and non-career commitments of teachers inside and outside the school context, and the implications for staff development.
Syracuse University Syracuse, NY	62,505	7/80 - 9/81	400790052	The project is a qualitative, sociological study of the success of mainstreaming and the delineation of the role of staff development in that success.
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, NC	32,600	8/80 - 9/81	400790056	This project, in collaboration with a large school system, will further refine the conceptual framework to study the effects and effectiveness of alternative staff development approaches.
University of Florida Gainesville, FL	8,588	6/80 - 4/81	400790075	This study is designed to examine teachers' sense of efficacy in unusually effective schools as compared to teachers' sense of efficacy in less effective schools.
California Learning Designs, Inc. Westminster, CA	37,781	11/79 - 6/80	400800002	This project is designed to demonstrate the short-term uses of ethnography in school districts by examining children's language learning (bilingual, multicultural) in school and community settings.

• TESTING, ASSESSMENT, AND EVALUATION

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Southwest Research Associates Albuquerque, NM	$ 15,000	8/80 - 7/81	NIECG00083	This research project will examine by qualitative research methods the processes involved in the testing situation of native American students.
Grant Wood Area Education Agency Cedar Rapids, IA	14,917	7/80 - 6/81	NIECG00084	The project proposes to validate a diagnostic interpretation technique for certain testing procedures. Relationships between skills tested under different types of tests will be reviewed, as well as teacher and student attitudes toward the tests.
Illinois State Office of the Governor Springfield, IL	14,898	8/80 - 8/81	NIECG00088	The study deals with the issue of test appropriateness and/or test biases with a focus on the local school district level, analyzes factors influencing test performance, and conducts an experimental case study to discover and test the relevance of several types of student information.
University of South Carolina Columbia, SC	23,000	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG80079	This study will investigate seven major problems related to field testing in the basic skills assessment programs and to the use of criterion-referenced test data at the school district level. The study focuses among other problems on ways to improve the interpretation of objective-referenced test data, and procedures to improve the use of test information to help identify deficiencies of poor test achievers.
University of Iowa Iowa City, IA	14,601	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG80079	Research will help "bridge the gap" between theoretical investigation and practical consideration for test construction (and analysis) by purposefully selecting test data with a varying number of objectives and observing the fit of latent trait models to these data.
Applied Social Research, Inc. Los Angeles, CA	37,585	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG80081	This project is designed to study the effects on measures of achievement, both written and oral tests, in two languages (Spanish and English) for students who have been trained in test-taking skills compared to those students who have not.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Tucson Board of Education Tucson, AZ	$ 12,191	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800076	Students lacking in test-taking skills suffer in the American education system. This research will investigate test-taking skills in four ethnic populations: blacks, Mexican Americans, native Americans, and Anglos.
University of Florida Gainesville, FL	50,253	7/80 - 12/80	NIEG800077	Project will examine classroom observational techniques and psychometric assessment results to facilitate exceptional child classroom placement decision-making.
University of Chicago Chicago, IL	49,819	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800078	This project will develop and test a statistical method for building educational measurement systems which will meet the basic requirements of fair and useful testing.
Center for Applied Linguistics Arlington, VA	45,398	9/80 - 4/81	NIEG800149	The study will determine whether standardized tests of reading comprehension, in their lack of control for structural linguistic variables such as discourse type, logical relations between propositions and syntactic complexity, unfairly penalize certain students.
The Psychological Corporation New York, NY	11,082	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800075	The research activity will field-test the International Reading Association's (IRA) adaptation of the "standards for evaluation" in several local school districts. The field test will assess the usefulness of the adapted standards to local school programs' needs.
Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, MD	49,062	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800080	The purpose of this study is to discover ways for improving the use of achievement test data in educational management by exploring a combination of recent technical advances and the expert judgments of actual school management personnel.
Orleans Parish School Board New Orleans, LA	12,309	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG8000A2	The project will result in an integrated compilation of previous theorizing and research related to evaluation utilization, and will involve both a survey study of local educational administrators' perceptions of evaluation and a simulation experiment to identify factors which optimize evaluation utilization.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Indiana University Bloomington, IN	$ 75,675	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800089	This project will develop and evaluate a systematic data management and information system which will provide regular and resource teachers of inner-city mildly handicapped high-school pupils with daily records of appropriateness and effectiveness of instruction, as well as the progress of each student in each subject area.
Tucson Board of Education Tucson, AZ	19,966	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800090	This grant will be used to conduct an in-depth classroom implementation study of a supplemental activities-based mathematics project designed for low-achieving minority students.
Huron Institute Cambridge, MA	21,080	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG780151	Project is focusing on how to use and "combine" data from different types of evaluative research studies.
Duke University Durham, NC	40,000	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG780089	Study is comparing different mathematical methods of analyzing long-range studies.
*University of Mid-America Lincoln, NE	300,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG750001	This research study involves the development and operation of a model post-secondary open-learning system which reaches people through television, audio cassettes, and other technical innovations. The system is a consortium of eleven universities in Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota.
University of Kansas Lawrence, KS	45,414	5/80 - 9/81	NIEG790156	The study is focusing on measurement of the reasoning processes which underlie students' responses to ability tests.
Michigan State University East Lansing, MI	60,686	9/80 - 9/81	400790067	Funded jointly with Department of Defense dependents schools, this project trains teachers on how to use testing information for making instructional decisions.
Huron Institute Cambridge, MA	130,000	9/80 - 9/81	400790061	Funded jointly with the U.S. Office of Education and with NIE's Dissemination and Improvement of Practice group, this project studies school districts who have successfully tied evaluation and test information to managerial and instructional improvement.
Northwestern University Evanston, IL	115,200	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790128	Project to advance the better understanding of methods for planning and evaluating innovations in education.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences Washington, DC	$ 285,000	2/80 - 2/81	400790014	Project is evaluating Project Excel, an urban education program focusing on high-risk inner-city youth and funded by the Department of Education.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, VA	46,942	10/80 - 5/81	NIEG790140	Research on reasons why students give highly improbable answers on tests, with special emphasis on black and white students who scored extremely low on the minimum competency examination given by the Commonwealth of Virginia.
Stanford University Stanford, CA	84,699	10/80 - 9/81	NIEG790139	Project examines reading achievement, and should contribute to the state of the art and of practice in multiple-attribute measurement of instructional progress.
DeAvila, Duncan, and Associates, Inc. Larkspur, CA	18,077	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790155	This study investigates cultural differences in test-taking skills. Findings should directly help improve test construction, interpretation, and test-giving circumstances. The populations studied will be black, Anglo, and Mexican-American.
McLeod Corporation Washington, DC	250,511	8/80 - 10/81	400800022	This study is designed to serve the information needs of state and local policymakers and program planners on issues related to minimum competency testing (MCT). The primary objectives of the project are to provide decision-makers with a clearer understanding of the dynamics of MCT and to provide a vehicle for the involvement of parents, teachers, students, citizen's groups, administrators, school board members, legislators, and other interested parties in a process that will help inform responsive policy at the state and local level.
Education Commission of the States Denver, CO	4,161,990	1/80 - 12/80	NIEG800003	Project supports the conduct of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), a continuing survey of American students' knowledge, and the analysis of NAEP data.
University of Wisconsin Milwaukee, WI	34,834	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG790129	Research directed at assessing problems encountered by black students in studying course materials, particularly the diagnosis of general reading comprehension errors.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
*Evaluation Research Society Cambridge, MA	$ 31,660	10/77 - 1/81	NIEG770069	This project provides technical review and consultation for the evaluation of the Cities In Schools demonstration.
American Institutes for Research Washington, DC	170,353	3/80 - 10/80	400770107	The purpose of this contract is to provide supportive services to the Cities In Schools evaluation effort. These services are provided by the school system. Specific tasks include development of stakeholder groups, testing of students in the program, and gathering of historical and demographic data.
Huron Institute Cambridge, MA	101,250	5/80 - 5/83	400800008	The purpose of this utility and synthesis study is to find ways to increase evaluation productivity. This will be done by discovering strategies designed to maximize use for decision-making and for increasing insight through cross-study analysis.
RMC Research Corporation Mountain View, CA	9,605	10/78 - 4/80	400780021	Evaluation of the replication of the Career Intern Program, an alternative high school for dropouts and potential dropouts, which has become the model for a two-year demonstration program jointly sponsored by the National Institute of Education and the U.S. Department of Labor.
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Portland, OR	53,054	9/80 - 9/81	400800105	Research on the effectiveness of the process used to assess minimum competency testing.
Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC) Philadelphia, PA	5,965	9/80 - 1/81	NIEG780025	Purpose of study is to replicate the Career Intern Program (CIP) as developed by OIC of America and piloted at the Philadelphia OIC. Evidence of CIP's effectiveness in achieving its objectives was found compelling in May 1977 by HEW's Education Division's Joint Dissemination Review Panel.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND ORGANIZATION

- **GENERAL**

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Various	$447,382	10/79 - 9/80	Various	Preparation of planning papers, reports, reviews, and other small procurements related to the EPO mission.
National Institute for Community Development Arlington, VA	46,136	10/79 - 7/80	400790036	Technical assistance for grants competition review and applications, and for conference management for program planning.
Dingle Associates Washington, DC	120,296	9/79 - 11/80	400790035	To provide support for planning conferences, grants seminars, study group meetings, report preparation, etc.
YOUTH POLICY STUDIES				
Urban Institute Washington, DC	123,466	9/80 - 9/81	400800014	The purpose of this project is to support several research projects on the formation, organization, and impact of public policies for youth.
University of Chicago Chicago, IL	148,160	9/80 - 9/81	400800015	This study seeks to increase the current level of understanding of public- and private-sector relationships in delivery of youth services through: (a) analyzing the changing role of the voluntary sector in the development of policy related to the delivery of youth services, (b) developing and testing of a model for comparing the cost efficiency of similar services, (c) identifying innovative public-voluntary collaborative efforts and studying the effectiveness of these organizational and financial relationships, and (d) presenting recommendations on production of public-voluntary relationships useful to administrators and policymakers involved in services to youths.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
YOUTH POLICY STUDIES (cont.)				
Rand Corporation Santa Monica, CA	$ 77,311	9/80 - 9/81	400800016	This study is a historically grounded inquiry into the theory and practice of delinquency prevention in the 20th century. It focuses on reforms and/or progressive efforts in delinquency prevention in the past, in order to better understand current reforms.
Abt Associates Cambridge, MA	30,213	5/80 - 12/80	400780032	This study examines the role and effectiveness of education and work councils in improving the transition of youth from school to work.

• EDUCATIONAL FINANCE •

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems Boulder, CO	$ 24,000	7/80 - 10/80	400800109	Contractor will assist NIE in data collection and analysis and in report preparation for the study entitled Financing Higher Education in the Fifty States--1978.
Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ	88,350	9/80 - 10/81	400800041	The contractor will prepare a guidebook which will help state policymakers and those affected by the policy development process choose among alternative systems for financing special education.
International Business Service Washington, DC	7,855	5/80 - 9/80	400790047	Development of a bibliographic handbook for issues of higher education planning, management, finance, and organization.
Education Commission of the States Denver, CO	111,365	9/80 - 12/81	400790072	A study of community college tuition and student aid policies in the 50 states and the effect of these policies on access for low-income, minority, and nontraditional students.
C.M. Leinwand Associates Newton, MA	38,347	11/79 - 6/80	400780024	This project will result in two major products: a data archive for the Alum Rock Education Voucher Demonstration Project and an archive methodology handbook that is designed to guide the development of archives for large social science data bases.
International Business Service Washington, DC	34,992	5/80 - 5/82	400770086	To provide support for the preparation of summary reports by national experts on research findings and observations in the economics and finance of higher education.
*Education Commission of the States Denver, CO	247,137	6/80 - 5/81	400800042	The purpose of this project is to inform state-level education policymakers and other interested parties about recent school finance developments in the courts, state legislatures, and the academic community. Activities include publication of a quarterly newsletter, preparation of policy papers, and sponsorship of periodic regional workshops.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Westinghouse Evaluation Institute Evanston, IL	$ 209,300	3/80 - 12/81	400800004	The contractor will design and implement a study on the economic, social, educational, and organizational effects of operating schools of differing size.
*University of California Berkeley, CA	90,052	12/79 - 11/80	NIEG800004	This multidisciplinary research project is exploring children's use of time outside of school and the degree to which it has been influenced by the enactment of tax and expenditure limitations in California.

o LAW AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
The Huron Institute Cambridge, MA	$ 13,464	6/80 - 8/81	NIECG00136	The study will examine the political factors that affect the development of public two-year colleges and their occupational programs in Washington (state) and Illinois.
University of Washington Seattle, WA	61,352	7/80 - 12/81	NIECG00138	This study focuses on two problems: (1) how policymakers and analysts can understand the programmatic consequences of policy decisions, and (2) how the Federal government can influence movement from school to work.
University of Maryland Baltimore County Campus Baltimore, MD	57,640	9/80 - 8/81	NIECG00139	This grant provides for a historical analysis of the development of public policy in education during the period 1961-1969.
Cornell University Ithaca, NY	14,094	6/80 - 6/81	NIECG00049	This study will examine the basis of New York law prohibiting arbitration of local board tenure decisions.
George Washington University Washington, DC	9,995	4/80 - 3/81	NIECG00043	This study seeks to identify emerging and continuing educational policy issues in 30 states. The study will provide a current picture of the issues, people, and processes that make up the world of educational policymaking at the state level.
Indian Education Training, Inc. Albuquerque, NM	73,074	10/80 - 10/81	NIECG00001	This study will explore the legislative history of Public Law 95-561, Title XI, investigate the implementation of this enactment, examine its effects upon LEA's and native American school children, and assess its efficacy as a tool for achievement of educational equity.
Institute for the Study of Contemporary Social Problems Seattle, WA	11,786	6/80 - 9/80	NIECG00050	This study will survey and assess the scholarly literature and theory about the public roles of private organizations of teachers.
National Center for State Courts Williamsburg, VA	96,960	9/80 - 9/81	NIECG00137	This grant proposes to study the distribution of educational equity litigation between Federal and state courts. The study will explore whether there has been a trend in recent years toward an increased use of state courts in educational equity cases and will examine the question of forum choice--why attorneys choose the Federal or state courts.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Rand Corporation Santa Monica, CA	$ 112,939	4/80 - 3/81	NIEG800030	This study will examine the role of states (political, cultural, and organizational factors; role of the governor; and legislative and state departments of education) in implementing Federal education policies.
National Opinion Research Center Chicago, IL	73,643	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800051	This study will explore whether, at the Federal level, a major objective of educational policy is the redistribution of resources; and whether, at the local level, a major objective is economic development.
Aspire of America New York, NY	10,000	4/80 - 3/81	NIEG800039	The study addresses the need for understanding and analysis of the policy impact of more than thirty suits brought by litigants claiming that language of instruction and related policies and/or practices precluded their rights to equal educational opportunity guaranteed under the Civil Rights Act (Title VII).
Arizona State University Tempe, AZ	9,892	5/80 - 5/81	NIEG800047	This study will examine and analyze the organized groups, agencies, organizations, and individuals which influence the state legislature in the formulation of educational finance policy.
University of Illinois Urbana, IL	22,388	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800188	This study identifies differences in attribution (interpretations given to a particular behavior) made in a large variety of school-related situations by Hispanic students and Anglo teachers caused by culture role.
Shaker Heights City School District Shaker Heights, OH	14,930	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800189	This study examines black students' access to "gifted and talented" programs. It will include an extensive literature review and interviews of heads of gifted and talented programs in 35 school districts identified as effective.
University of Minnesota St. Paul, MN	12,954	9/80 - 6/81	NIEG800192	This study is preparing a comprehensive meta-analysis of the research efforts on cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning situations. It will look specifically at inter-ethnic interactions and relationships.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA	21,884	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800184	This study is an investigation of interrelations between labor relations and desegregation, identifying and analyzing how teachers and their union representatives impact on the desegregation process through the process of collective bargaining. Three sites will be studied: Boston, Dade County (Florida), and Los Angeles.

83-574 O—81——11

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Systems Development Corporation Santa Monica, CA	$ 6,385	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800183	This study is analyzing data collected for an evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act in order to assess the causal link between the percentage of blacks and white hostility in desegregated schools.
Washington University St. Louis, MO	20,982	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800187	This study is examining the consequences for non-public schools (and the reciprocal consequences for the St. Louis Public Schools) of the court-ordered desegregation scheduled to begin in September 1980.
Catholic University of America Washington, DC	23,094	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800193	The goal of this project is to describe the role that schools play in residential segregation processes. It is exploring the relationship between school segregation levels and levels of housing discrimination by testing the propositions that school segregation enhances residential segregation through its effect on housing marketing practices and, conversely, that school desegregation under some circumstances reduces housing segregation through a lessening of housing discrimination.
Huron Institute Cambridge, MA	141,546	11/79 - 11/80	400760163	This contract was funded to develop effective strategies to implement the Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE) Program into the mainstream of educational practice, transforming it from what had been largely an experimental program effort.
Rand Corporation Santa Monica, CA	78,266	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG780150	Research on the impact of different types of desegregation plans on the learning of basic skills by minority students.
University of Wisconsin Madison, WI	160,616	9/80 - 12/81	NIEG790183	Affirmative action enforcement in higher education.
Stanford University Stanford, CA	25,168	12/79 - 11/80	NIEG800111	Support for: four commissioned papers on educational policy formulation, especially higher education policy; and the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance conference on Costs and Financing of Recurrent Education Categorical Grants in Education.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Rand Corporation Santa Monica, CA	$ 74,642	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG800048	This study will compare the formal and informal management systems used by three Federal education programs to affect state and local education policy.
Rebell and Krieger New York, NY	54,397	1/80 - 1/81	NIEG800032	This is a study of the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) investigation in New York City into a wide variety of alleged discriminatory practices, including teacher and student placements, tracking practices, suspension and disciplinary procedures, and employment practices. The study will focus on issues of implementation of Federal policy, egalitarian theory, and, in conjunction with an earlier study, comparisons among the three branches of government.

o EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN	$ 68,662	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800170	This study will examine case studies of school districts' responses to declining enrollments and analyze them to find explanations for the chosen actions.
University of Illinois Urbana, IL	15,535	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG800160	This study will begin to explore the extent to which different types of social settings in schools affect patterns of communication and teacher attitudes toward change and improvement.
University of Washington Seattle, WA	14,430	8/80 - 1/81	NIEG800131	This study will examine the political history of decisions to close schools in Seattle during the last five years, in order to determine what factors contributed to these decisions.
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Austin, TX	12,200	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800130	This study will explore the consequences of role stress in a group of junior high-school teachers in a variety of racially-mixed schools.
University of Illinois Urbana, IL	108,074	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800152	The purpose of this study is to understand how school superintendents manage important issues and thus control the range and type of services of their school districts.
Yale University New Haven, CT	61,264	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800151	This study involves case studies of the growth and effectiveness of educational service centers, drawing on theories of innovation, organizational growth and development, and interorganizational relations.
University of Chicago Chicago, IL	15,467	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800169	The study will examine the means of central-office control over principals.
University of Alaska Fairbanks, AK	74,977	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800147	The study will examine the consequences of decentralization of education to the local level in rural Alaskan communities of various governance structures and kinds of populations.
Washington University St. Louis, MO	40,247	9/80 - 12/81	NIEG800186	The study will examine the relationship between the evaluation and authority systems of public high schools and the extent to which students in these schools become alienated.
University of Lowell Lowell, MA	24,340	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800145	The project will examine various responses to enrollment decline and the effects of enrollment decline on relations among teachers.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation Ypsilanti, MI	$ 71,668	6/80 - 5/81	NIEG800046	The study will examine the mechanisms that operate to resist implementation of an innovation in a school.
University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA	88,452	12/79 -12/81	NIEG800006	Research will focus on characteristics related to high achievement rates of students in predominantly black urban elementary schools.
University of California Berkeley, CA	52,450	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG800165	A historical study of the common pressures for primary education in 19th-century Britain and the U.S., and of the different ways of organizing schooling.
University of Kansas Wichita, KS	11,252	5/80 - 12/80	NIEG800053	The grantee will organize and convene a conference in which the participants will explore the problems involved in classifying and comparing organizations, including schools.
Institute for Responsive Education Boston, MA	13,422	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800171	A review and analysis of studies that describe school board responsiveness to community concerns.
University of Washington Seattle, WA	19,428	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800166	A review and analysis of career mobility of nonteaching professionals in universities.
Pennsylvania State University State College, PA	19,887	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800191	The project will study and report on the role of women in changes that took place in Cornell University, Mt. Holyoke, and Wells College during the period 1875-1921.
Abt Associates Cambridge, MA	24,109	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG8001A1	Project will study four colleges in order to develop a model of institutional behavior during a period of decline.
Center for Cross-Cultural Studies University of Alaska Fairbanks, AK	20,315	9/80 - 12/81	NIEG800185	Researcher proposes to conduct ethnographic study of communication patterns at the University of Alaska.
Washington University St. Louis, MO	93,119	5/80 - 5/81	NIEG780074	Study of the effects of an innovative school and faculty careers over a 15-year period, to uncover long-term effects of change.
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, IL	11,694	2/80 - 12/80	NIEG780077	Analysis of school superintendents' activities and roles in daily work as they compare to those of other executives.
Cornell University Ithaca, NY	70,417	2/80 -11/80	NIEG780080	Survey and case studies of power, authority, and decision-making in schools and districts, and effects on educational outcomes.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of Rochester Rochester, NY	$ 74,991	5/80 - 6/81	NIEG780056	Comparison of school-board behavior under conditions of growth and decline.
National Opinion Research Center Chicago, IL	108,223	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780100	Historical study of working peoples' interests and how schools responded to them in Chicago, San Francisco, and Atlanta.
CPI Associates, Inc. Washington, DC	8,372	4/80 - 5/80	400780027	Study of classroom organization as it reflects differences in administration across schools.
University of California San Diego, CA	71,014	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780177	Analysis of the processes of referral and placement of special needs students and the effects of these on the students' futures.
*American Federation of Teachers (AFT) Washington, DC	125,000	6/80 - 1/81	400770092	The study will examine the impact of changes in the educational decision-making process on grass roots participation. It deals with informal networks initiated by parents to promote educational programs for children whose interests are not represented by local school authorities.
University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA	173,197	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790154	Study of the relationship between the family, the organization of the school, and the organization of work in 19th-century Philadelphia, and the implications of these patterns for economic well-being.
Wisconsin Center for Public Policy Madison, WI	34,446	12/79 - 2/81	NIEG790013	Study of the conduct of high-school social studies classes as they reflect school organization.
New York Interface Development Project, Inc. New York, NY	45,532	2/80 - 11/80	NIEG790016	Study of effects of decentralization in several New York City districts.
University of Wisconsin Madison, WI	38,046	12/79 - 12/80	NIEG790017	Study of the organization of magnet schools with differing programs.
Carnegie-Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA	92,895	12/79 - 12/80	NIEG790018	Analysis of how school officials learn about and respond to Federal regulations.
University of Illinois Chicago, IL	49,563	1/80 - 7/80	NIEG790019	Study of the work of school principals in Chicago.
Stanford University Stanford, CA	57,496	2/80 - 12/80	NIEG790020	Analysis of development of the division of labor that made administration a male occupation and teaching a female occupation, and why this pattern persists.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Claremont Graduate School Claremont, CA	$ 93,056	3/80 - 1/81	NIEG790036	Study of citizen participation in collective bargaining in education and its effects.
Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN	106,927	1/80 - 1/81	NIEG790037	Examination of selected schools in the Nashville School District to determine the extent of the application of new procedures for educating handicapped children under P.L. 94-142.
JWK International Corporation Annandale, VA	3,688	7/80 - 10/80	400790080	Study of women and minorities as school principals.
National Opinion Research Center Chicago, IL	34,444	1/80 - 12/80	400790005	An exploratory study to examine the impact of parent networks on local educational decision-making.
Institute for Social Research University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI	106,473	1/80 - 12/80	400790006	A study on the adjustment of new teachers to their first positions, with emphasis on social support networks among new teachers.
Oakland University Rochester, MI	83,760	5/80 - 1/81	400790007	This project will examine the process of desegregation in the school-community social networks in a Midwestern city.
Center on Technology and Society Cambridge, MA	51,885	1/80 - 12/80	400790008	Case histories and comparative analysis of networks for improving elementary and secondary education.
Institute for Social Research University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI	33,507	1/80 - 9/80	NIEG770023	Conduct of field experiments on effects of alternative school programs for disruptive and delinquent adolescents who otherwise are likely to be expelled or suspended from their schools.
Far West Lab for Education Research and Development San Francisco, CA	164,000	7/80 - 6/81	400780047	Support for a small grants competition for research on experienced teacher centers.
National Rural Center Washington, DC	55,611	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790166	An investigation of America's smallest rural schools.

C.H. Leinwand Associates Newton, MA	35,868	9/80 - 9/81	400780054	To provide additional support to complete the construction of a compensatory education study data archive.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Center for Education Policy and Management University of Oregon Eugene, OR	$ 117,718	2/80 - 9/81	NIEG800110	Development of a dissemination program involving training for principals and local district administrators, as well as the development of training materials and practitioner seminars based on research findings.
Enterprises for New Directions, Inc. Bethesda, MD	22,403	9/80 - 9/81	400800028	A preliminary exploration of community-based programs that work in conjunction with schools to serve minority families.
*National Academy of Sciences Washington, DC	170,000	2/80 - 2/81	400800006	Review and synthesis of the current research on "work, family and community." The particular emphasis will be on the ability of families to educate and socialize children with support from schools and other community institutions and with particular reference to family structure.
*Florida State University Tallahassee, FL	49,619	9/80 - 2/81	400800019	A review and synthesis of the experience of a major Federally-funded educational research project that was innovative in its use of case-study research methods.
Abt Associates Cambridge, MA	100,000	9/80 - 9/81	400800017	A two-year study of current practices of selecting school principals, together with a study of selected innovations in such practices. A six-month dissemination option exists.
Abt Associates Cambridge, MA	79,993	9/80 - 9/81	400800027	The study will analyze what happens in twelve districts as school boards and school personnel shift from junior high to middle schools. The final report will summarize the case studies and indicate what factors contribute to productive planning and implementation.
Systems Development Corporation Santa Monica, CA	65,000	9/80 - 12/81	400800039	Development of a set of papers to advance the use of theory and methods in school desegregation research.

DISSEMINATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF PRACTICE

- General

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
National Institute for Community Development Roselyn, VA	$ 307,219	2/80 - 3/81	400790036	Management of seminars to provide field participation for program planning and seminars for research and development efforts.
Various individuals	153,476	Various	Various	Preparation of planning papers, reports, reviews, and other miscellaneous small procurements for existing or proposed projects.
Dingle Associates Washington, DC	63,043	12/79 - 9/80	400790033	Provision of technical assistance to and conduct of regional research and development workshops and seminars.

- **Experimental Program for Opportunities in Advanced Study and Research in Education:** The purpose of this grants program is to support experimental activities that demonstrate effective ways of increasing participation of minorities and women at an advanced level of educational research.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of Southern California Los Angeles, CA	$ 93,800	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780229	Grants for Opportunities in Advanced Study and Research (also continued on the following three pages)
La Casa de Puerto Rico Hartford, CT	40,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780187	
Howard University Washington, DC	84,500	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780181	
National Council of La Raza Washington, DC	100,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780186	
Purdue University W. Lafayette, IN	18,088	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780233	
Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, MI	63,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790011	
San Diego State University San Diego, CA	81,500	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790006	
American Medical Women's Association Tucson, AZ	43,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790007	
Virginia Union University Richmond, VA	74,979	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790008	

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, AL	$ 75,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790009	Grants for Opportunities in Advanced Study and Research (cont.)
HALDEY San Francisco, CA	78,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790053	
MPS/UM Teacher Center Minnesota University Minneapolis, MN	49,950	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780180	
*Graduate School and University Center of the City of New York New York, NY	997	6/80 - 6/81	400780036	
Radcliffe College Cambridge, MA	90,477	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780236	
Colegio Cesar Chavez Mt. Angel, OR	48,488	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780188	
University of Texas Austin, TX	98,955	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780227	
Asian-American Bilingual Center Berkeley, CA	40,000	11/79 - 10/80	NIEG790010	
Michigan State University East Lansing, MI	83,885	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG790052	
Bloomsbury West, Inc. San Francisco, CA	90,000	6/80 - 5/81	NIEG790065	

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Northeastern University Boston, MA	$ 84,000	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG790066	Grants for Opportunities in Advanced Study and Research (cont.)
Minnesota Department of Education St. Paul, MN	45,000	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG790067	
University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN	90,000	6/80 - 7/81	NIEG790068	
University of Georgia Athens, GA	76,000	5/80 - 6/81	NIEG790064	
City University of New York New York, NY	77,000	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG790060	
Hampton Institute Hampton, VA	45,000	5/80 - 4/81	NIEG790061	
ASPIRA of America, Inc. Springfield, VA	105,000	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG790062	
National Association of Asian and Pacific American Education Seattle, WA	45,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG790063	
Latino Institute Chicago, IL	100,000	5/80 - 6/81	NIEG790069	
Wellesley College Wellesley, MA	40,982	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG790058	
Ohio State University Columbus, OH	45,000	5/80 - 5/81	NIEG790057	

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Institute for Educational Leadership Washington, DC	$ 105,000	5/80 - 5/81	NIEG790056	Grants for Opportunities in Advanced Study and Research (cont.)
Atlanta University Atlanta, GA	45,000	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG790055	
Virginia State College Petersburg, VA	45,000	6/80 - 5/81	NIEG790054	
University of Texas Austin, TX	86,300	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG790051	
URSA San Francisco, CA	50,114	9/80 - 4/81	400800034	
*American Education Research Association (AERA) Washington, DC	59,896	3/80 - 10/80	NIEG800041	
Columbia University New York, NY	132,552	2/79 - 2/80	NIEG780183	
Northwestern University Evanston, IL	89,933	10/79 - 9/80	NIEG780184	

- INFORMATION RESOURCES

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Operations Research, Inc. Bethesda, MD	$ 896,343	11/79 - 11/80	400760031	Provision of support for central processing and reference services for the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).
Oryx Press Phoenix, AZ	50,000	12/79 - 12/80	400790009	Maintenance of the Current Index to Journals in Education, an information source and dissemination tool of ERIC.
Computer Microfilm International Corporation Arlington, VA	80,000	6/80 - 6/81	400[illegible]0031	Document reproduction services which provide, in either microfiche or hard copy format, the full texts of reports in the ERIC collection. Produces and distributes microfiche of ERIC documents monthly to over 700 customers.
*National Public Radio Washington, DC	72,000	1/80 - 12/80	NIEG760033	This award supported partial programming cost of the award-winning "Options in Education" radio series. The series provides a national forum for informed discussion and analysis of education issues.
*Alaska State Department of Education Juneau, AK	600,000	2/80 - 6/81	NIEG770040	This project explores the use of a communications satellite to serve the educational needs of rural and remote areas of Alaska by linking the state's 52 school districts and some 200 communities to satellite administrative support services and computer-based education resources.
Appalachian Regional Commission Washington, DC	1,240,000	10/79 - 9/80	NIEIA80003	This project explores the use of a communications satellite to serve the educational needs of rural and remote areas of Appalachia.
Information Planning Assoc. Rockville, MD	83,989	1/80 - 9/80	400800005	Study of technology and use of small computers for the ERIC system.
*Lockheed Missles and Space Company Sunnyvale, CA	40,000	4/80 - 3/81	400780019	The contractor will provide NIE with a high-speed CRT terminal communicating at 480 characters per second over a Lockheed supplied leased dedicated network and data set. This supplies unlimited communication access to the Dialog on-line information retrieval system during its normal operating hours which include the full NIE business day.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Information Planning Assoc. Rockville, MD	$ 26,000	10/79 - 9/80	400780001	This contract provides a broad range of technical processing services to NIE's educational research library.
Various publishers, etc.	100,011	10/79 - 9/80	Various	The NIE Library is the Federal library for educational research. It provides technical resources along with reference and information retrieval services to the Department of Education, as well as other Federal agencies and the general public.

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national system whose primary purpose is to compile and analyze educational research and development information and make it accessible to researchers and practitioners. Clearinghouses in the ERIC system focus on particular subjects, as follows:

National Center for Research in Vocational Education Ohio State University Columbus, OH	351,083	9/80 - 9/81	400760122	ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career and Vocational Education.
University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI	267,060	12/79 - 12/80	400780005	ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services.
University of Illinois Urbana, IL	235,455	1/80 - 1/81	400780008	ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.
University of Oregon Eugene, OR	256,996	12/79 - 12/80	400780007	ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
Council for Exceptional Children Reston, VA	282,825	9/80 - 8/81	400760119	ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children.
George Washington University Washington, DC	312,225	9/80 - 8/81	400770073	ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
Syracuse University Syracuse, NY	276,820	1/80 - 12/80	400770015	ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources.
University of California Los Angeles, CA	202,477	10/80 - 10/81	400780038	ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Center for Applied Linguistics Arlington, VA	$ 275,417	6/80 - 5/81	400770049	ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.
National Council of Teachers of English Urbana, IL	328,445	6/79 - 5/80	400780026	ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills.
New Mexico State University Las Cruces, NM	281,950	3/80 - 3/81	400780023	ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
Ohio State University Columbus, OH	284,710	10/80 - 9/81	400780004	ERIC Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education.
Social Science Education Consortium, Inc. Boulder, CO	274,990	1/80 - 12/80	400780006	ERIC Clearinghouse on Social Studies/Social Science Education.
Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ	256,708	1/80 - 12/80	400780003	ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurements and Evaluation.
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Washington, DC	289,259	3/80 - 3/81	400780017	ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.
Teachers College Columbia University New York, NY	267,033	9/80 - 8/81	400770071	ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

• REGIONAL PROGRAMS

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
American Assoc. of School Administrators* Arlington, VA	$ 51,470	4/80 - 12/80	400800011	To provide staff and logistical support for planning and conducting conference sessions focused on the outcome of NIE's research and development.
Southeastern Regional Council for Education Improvement Triangle, NC	347,509	11/80 - 11/81	NIEG800005	This award supports research and development services to address the needs of unserved groups in ten states in the southeast region of the country. Includes policy research and analyses.
Northeastern Consortium Albany, NY	47,184	11/80 - 11/81	NIEG790038	A consortium of seven State Education Agencies of Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont and representative practitioners will plan for the establishment of a regional exchange to (1) develop ways of coordinating dissemination, (2) increase use of research and development, and (3) assess information needs of practitioners.

Dissemination Capacity Building Grants to state education agencies (SEA's) provide support to develop and strengthen the dissemination and use of educational knowledge by states, including technical assistance provided by SEA staffs to aid local education agencies (LEA's) in the use of the results of educational R&D to improve educational practice. The grants are awards of one-year duration, renewable over a three- to five-year period.

Alabama State Department of Education Montgomery, AL	58,500	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG760052	State Dissemination Capacity Building Grants (also continued on following two pages)
Arizona State Department of Education Phoenix, AZ	26,290	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG780009	
Arkansas State Department of Education Little Rock, AR	95,000	2/80 - 2/81	NIEG800023	
California Office of Information and Dissemination Sacramento, CA	99,900	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG760057	
Colorado Department of Education Denver, CO	89,976	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG760051	
Public Schools of the District of Columbia Washington, DC	69,383	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG800026	

*Erroneously listed as "American Assoc. of Public Administration" in earlier printing.

82-874 O—81—12

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Florida State Department of Education Tallahassee, FL	$ 47,087	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG760050	State Dissemination Capacity Building Grants (cont.)
Georgia State Department of Education Atlanta, GA	63,356	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG760049	
Hawaii State Education Agency Honolulu, HI	103,637	11/79 - 11/80	NIEG780234	
Idaho State Department of Education Boise, ID	29,678	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG760064	
Illinois Office of Education Springfield, IL	89,389	12/79 - 12/80	NIEG750012	
Indiana Department of Public Instruction Indianapolis, IN	79,812	5/80 - 5/81	NIEG800018	
Kansas State Department of Education Topeka, KS	51,929	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG760048	
Louisiana State Department of Education Baton Rouge, LA	97,000	1/80 - 12/80	NIEG800019	
Maine State Department of Education Augusta, ME	94,583	1/80 - 12/80	NIEG800025	
Maryland State Department of Education Baltimore, MD	107,100	1/80 - 12/80	NIEG780232	
Massachusetts State Department of Education Boston, MA	90,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG760058	
Michigan State Department of Education Lansing, MI	85,757	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG760065	
Minnesota State Department of Education St. Paul, MN	76,500	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG760054	
Mississippi State Department of Education Jackson, MS	74,707	2/80 - 2/81	NIEG800020	

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Nebraska State Department of Education Lincoln, NE	$ 48,836	2/80 - 3/81	NIEG780013	State Dissemination Capacity Building Grants (cont.)
New Hampshire State Department of Education Concord, NH	54,000	3/80 - 3/81	NIEG760058	
Oklahoma State Department of Education Oklahoma City, OK	58,549	12/79 - 12/80	NIEG780014	
Oregon Department of Education Salem, OR	20,000	6/80 - 6/81	NIEG760063	
Pennsylvania State Department of Education Harrisburg, PA	106,195	11/79 - 10/80	NIEG780200	
Puerto Rico Department of Education Hato Rey, PR	50,000	1/80 - 1/81	NIEG800022	
Rhode Island State Department of Education Providence, RI	49,484	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG760055	
South Dakota Department of Education Pierre, SD	72,999	5/80 - 5/81	NIEG800017	
Tennessee State Education Agency Nashville, TN	56,502	12/79 - 12/80	NIEG780199	
Utah State Board of Education Salt Lake City, UT	51,000	11/79 - 12/80	NIEG780015	
Vermont State Department of Education Montpelier, VT	85,000	3/80 - 3/81	NIEG800024	
Virgin Islands Department of Education St. Thomas, VI	85,500	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG780016	
State Superintendent of Public Instruction Washington State Department of Education Olympia, WA	80,000	4/80 - 4/81	NIEG800021	
Wisconsin State Education Agency Madison, WI	76,500	1/80 - 1/81	NIEG780019	

• RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
National Testing Service Durham, NC	$ 37,565	7/80 - 4/81	400800021	The goal of this project is to help assure widespread distribution and use of findings of the study of the State Capacity Building Program, a program for strengthening and improving coordination of dissemination and school improvement services available through state departments of education. Nine specialized interpretative reports that are of interest to different audiences will be prepared.
Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, MA	348,875	4/80 - 3/81	400780002	A study of the Research and Development Utilization Program, an action research program helping schools examine and implement the products of educational research and development to achieve local school improvement objectives.
King Research, Inc. Rockville, MD	70,971	6/80 - 3/81	400790060	A study of the amount and use of the ERIC system by different types of user groups, and of the cost associated with system operations at all levels including the Federal share.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR (OD)

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Various individuals	$ 87,760	10/79 - 9/80	Various	Preparation of planning papers, reports, reviews, and other miscellaneous small procurements for existing or proposed projects related to the overall mission of the National Institute of Education.
Lab and Center Review Panel	45,509	4/80 - 9/80	Various	Support for Congressionally-mandated external reviews of long-range work proposals from the 17 regional educational laboratories and national research centers.
Various minority firms	106,725	10/79 - 9/80	Various	This special minority business project provided small minority- and women-owned firms an opportunity to obtain procurements and develop a track record in educational R&D.
Dingle Associates Washington, DC	26,598	9/80 - 10/80	ADD790035	To provide conference support for the Task Force on Nationwide Research and Development Services.
*George Washington University Washington, DC	30,650	9/80 - 8/81	NIEC800197	Provides for training and administrative services under the fellowship program offered to NIE's Education Policy Fellows.
George Washington University Washington, DC	104,501	9/80 - 9/81	Various	Support for participants in the Education Policy Fellowship Program.
*George Washington University Washington, DC	63,313	9/80 - 8/81	NIEC800177	To provide resources to the Institute for Educational Leadership to support journalists in an examination of local schools in conjunction with an NIE program to study effective schools.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA	$ 53,690	7/80 - 8/81	NIEG780219	This project will document and analyze the results of a two-year teacher development project funded by NIE during the period 1978-1980.
National Institute for Community Development Arlington, VA	192,530	11/79 - 4/80	400760026 400760036	Contractor provided conference support and technical assistance for FY 80 unsolicited grants cycles.
International Resource Development, Inc. La Grange, IL	55,000	1/80 - 3/81	400800003	Using a variety of measuring devices, this research is focusing on the social competency of a group of Hispanic students in elementary school.
Hampton Institute/Yale University Hampton, VA/New Haven, CT	50,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800180	This project will collect data on 15 individuals who have "beat the odds" and succeeded despite negative predictions of success. An analysis and description of the key factors which have contributed to their success will be prepared.
Harvard University Cambridge, MA	55,000	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800141	This project will compare characteristics of academically successful inmates (those who obtain a GED) with nonacademically successful inmates in order to identify sources of social, psychological, and contextual support for academic achievement among adult prison inmates.
Aspira of America Washington, DC	26,900	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800140	This research will document bilingual children's adaptation to the English mainstream after participation in a transitional bilingual education program.
Barnard College New York, NY	52,661	6/80 - 12/80	NIEG790087	In-depth interview and questionnaire study of processes by which a women's college influences post-college roles and lifestyles.
University of Oklahoma Norman, OK	33,367	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800142	This research analyzes school desegregation literature by using a relatively new technique called the case survey method. A handbook for local officials will also be prepared outlining suggested strategies/tactics for implementing desegregation.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
American Federation of Teachers Washington, DC	$ 70,000	2/80 - 11/80	NIEG800011	An exploration of working conditions related to teacher stress, with an emphasis upon the factors related to the culture of the school and the system.
Oregon State University Corvallis, OR	14,996	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG800161	Study will examine ways of strengthening schools of education through their increased involvement in research, development, evaluation, and dissemination. A report with a historical sketch and an analysis in relation to existing policies, programs, and incentives will be prepared.
Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN	45,000	2/80 - 1/81	NIEG800028	Research on differences in cognitive skills and strategies of good and poor learners, and on the effectiveness of the instructional enrichment program in modifying poor learners' skills.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA	69,757	5/80 - 1/81	NIEG790045	Development of a series of monographs to be negotiated on the changing social context of educational testing.
American Federation of Teachers Washington, DC	80,945	3/80 - 1/81	NIEG790041	Preparation of teacher handbook on testing and conduct of workshops on testing for teachers.
Carnegie-Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA	31,230	2/80 - 2/81	NIEG780035	Research on the nature of children's problem-solving abilities and the cognitive processes that underlie problem solving.
University of Minnesota College of Education Minneapolis, MN	39,669	1/80 - 11/80	NIEG790021	Identification of patterns of behavior attributed to educational influences.
The Rockefeller University New York, NY	43,357	1/80 - 12/80	NIEG790029	Investigation of inferential processes of adult readers in reading comprehension.
Columbia University New York, NY	45,997	1/80 - 1/81	NIEG790040	Investigation of the relationship between listening and reading strategies used by both skilled and unskilled readers.
University of Chicago Department of Education Chicago, IL	60,000	6/80 - 5/81	NIEG790125	Research will focus on social cognition and story comprehension by children aged three to thirteen years.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Stalling Enterprises, Inc. Mountain View, CA	$ 59,474	5/80 - 5/81	NIEG800010	Research on how secondary school level variables interact with classroom processes to promote student learning.
Bowling Green State University Bowling Green, OH	23,018	9/80 - 10/81	NIEG800146	This study will provide systematic information about the nature of the syntactic dysfunctions in basic writing of college students.
Columbia University New York, NY	99,965	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800179	This project will record and analyze the process of implementing an educational innovation at four different sites. One objective is to identify new ways to disseminate research and development findings.
Wayne State University Detroit, MI	22,000	7/80 - 6/81	NIEG800061	Academic progress of children whose parents are enrolled in the weekend college of Wayne State University will be assessed. Other educational effects will also be measured.
Educational Testing Service Princeton, NJ	110,000	1/80 - 10/80	NIEG790026	This study of 24-children classrooms (K-3) focused on how children learn to read, through naturalistic observation and description of individual qualities which mediate movement through beginning skills to proficiency.
College of Education University of Illinois Urbana, IL	63,508	1/80 - 12/80	NIEG790022	A study to ascertain the relative effects of a number of variables on women's achievement motivation and career motivation, plus development of a diagnostic instrument to aid in counseling women toward greater achievement.
Harvard University Cambridge, MA	101,569	3/80 - 1/81	NIEG780031	Series of analytic and descriptive studies in the cognitive domain investigating innovative thinking involved in metaphor usage.
National Urban Coalition Washington, DC	90,000	12/79 - 12/80	NIEG790042	A study of four collaborative programs in urban schools which have successfully involved private and public institutions.
Metropolitan Integration Research Center, Inc. Milwaukee, WI	39,720	2/80 - 2/81	NIEG800037	Investigation of the extent to which public officials and planners consider school desegregation plans in developing local housing assistance plans, assessment of racial impact of school on use of housing subsidies, and surveying of family attitudes.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
University of California Berkeley, CA	$ 86,839	5/80 - 10/81	NIEG800045	The project will examine the paradox of high educational aspirations and low school performance among black students.
Wellesley College Wellesley, MA	80,011	10/80 - 11/81	NIEG800009	Research on the characteristics of exemplary school-age child care projects, and the development of related policy and action manuals.
Harvard University Cambridge, MA	78,548	3/80 - 2/81	NIEG800035	A comparative analysis of the life histories of six prominent black scholars, with particular attention devoted to the impact of family backgrounds, achievement patterns, and teacher-student relationships on their successful careers.
Yale University New Haven, CT	44,413	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800133	A comparative investigation of three related issues in post-secondary education research: equity, diversity, and competence. The investigators are looking for the interaction of these three areas in Latin America, Eastern Europe, and the developed democratic nations.
New York University New York, NY	26,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800173	The project will examine and describe alternative descriptions of equity and equity measurement methodology for assessing state elementary and secondary school finance systems.
Rand Corporation Santa Monica, CA	22,455	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG790152	Study of the politics of school finance in California; in particular, the coalition politics surrounding the passage of AB 65, California's latest school finance equalization bill, and the impact of Proposition 13 on school finance reform.
Board of Education, City of Chicago Chicago, IL	85,000	3/80 - 12/80	NIEG790048	Development of a rapid retrieval information system on violence and vandalism, and a cataloging of school action programs designed to reduce school crime and disruption in order to give policy-makers up-to-date information.
Yale University New Haven, CT	44,924	6/80 - 8/81	NIEG790084	The proposed research will examine the question of the consequences of education finance practices by closely analyzing the later connections between financial decisions, educational policies and programs, and students' achievement.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Utah State University Logan, UT	$ 22,661	1/80 - 12/80	NIEG800008	Synthesis of the literature from the large number of research studies which have examined the treatment of hyperactivity in children.
Council of Chief State School Officers Washington, DC	116,523	3/80 - 3/81	NIEG800036	Support of: (1) the review of Federal/state dissemination activities, and (2) development of an agenda for future collaborative efforts for joint Federal/state dissemination.
Yale University New Haven, CT	20,000	1/80 - 9/81	NIEG800190	A systematic study of the ways knowledge is used in making decisions in the social arena. Sources of knowledge and methods of verification are of particular interest.
Yale University New Haven, CT	99,905	5/80 - 8/81	NIEG800044	A research study to: (1) determine the extent to which social scientists and educators know about and routinely apply the substance of one another's discipline; and (2) describe the attributes of each group's institutional culture tradition, training, etc., which may impede or enhance such collaboration.
American Education Research Association Washington, DC	14,836	2/80 - 2/81	NIEG800038	This award provides partial support to the Joint Committee of Professional Organizations, which, with representation from education groups, is working to develop guidelines and standards for educational evaluation.
Institute for Child Behavior and Development University of Illinois Urbana, IL	30,091	4/80 - 3/81	NIEG800015	Development of an elementary-school testing program and classroom teaching activities that eliminate motivational test bias.
Harvard University Center for Urban Studies Graduate School of Education Cambridge, MA	100,000	11/79 - 9/80	NIEG790030	A study which describes the ways in which instructional climates differ between schools that are particularly effective and those which are particularly ineffective in providing instruction to poor children.
Lansing School District Lansing, MI	23,878	2/80 - 2/81	NIEG800031	Pilot testing of self-report instruments for evaluating the effectiveness of effective programs designed for students in grades K through 6.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Pennsylvania State University University Park, PA	$ 50,000	2/80 - 2/81	NIEG800027	Collection of data from students who have been out of school for five to seven years, and evaluation of the effects that different forms of secondary school education have upon subsequent educational and occupational choice and performance.
North Texas State University Denton, TX	29,793	2/80 - 1/81	NIEG800012	This research will utilize a computer model of the human mind's thinking process in order to examine how students think, learn, and solve problems.
Columbia University New York, NY	35,000	2/80 - 1/81	NIEG800029	An analysis of picture-text combinations which both maintain the interest of the viewer/reader and motivate the acquisition of reading skills.
Columbia University New York, NY	30,000	1/80 - 11/81	NIEG800014	This project is devoted to exploring whether an initial behavioral model explains the psychological source of writing errors in adolescents.
Ohio State University Columbus, OH	18,005	1/80 - 1/81	NIEG790039	Examination of children's cognitive processes used in beginning writing. Results will help improve the teaching of writing.
Lynn J. Cadwallader Amherst, MA	9,680	8/80 - 1/81	NIEG800150	Utilizing a collection of primary source material recently discovered in Newton, Massachusetts, this historical inquiry examines teachers' perceptions of their emerging profession from 1840-1865.
Dr. Mary Anne Raywid Dix Hills, NY	39,000	9/80 - 9/81	NIEG800194	This project is developing a research plan for a major national study of alternative secondary schools by involving people from the schools, researchers, and policymakers who face decisions about new schools.
University of California Berkeley, CA	90,000	3/80 - 2/81	NIEG800034	A study of alternative procedures for conducting holistic writing assessments.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
Harvard University Graduate School of Education Cambridge, MA	$ 63,740	1/80 - 12/80	NIEG800013	Examination of the development of Spanish as a first language by young children. The study includes general characteristics of language acquisition and specific characteristics of Spanish.
University of Texas at Austin Austin, TX	24,900	7/80 - 12/81	NIEG800033	The study concerns the types of miscues produced and the types of feedback teachers give to students in an oral reading task.
Columbia University Teachers College New York, NY	42,390	1/81 - 12/81	NIEG800174	The proposed research is a second phase of an earlier NIE-funded study of children's perception of the school experience. Interview data will be analyzed in further depth.
Technical Education Research Centers, Inc. Cambridge, MA	65,917	9/80 - 8/81	NIEG800162	This study will conduct a weekly research seminar for teachers which is based on successful pilot programs and which offers an alternative to existing models of collaborative research. Project also will research questions relating to teachers' utilization of research-produced knowledge, and investigate patterns of participating teachers' initial and developing interests and the relationship of those interests to current educational research and theory.
Center for Applied Linguistics Arlington, VA	100,000	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800133	This is a study of the acquisition of Black English by working class black children. Significant problems of educational assessment, normalizing, and equity can arise for this population in the absence of this data.
University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA	69,999	8/80 - 8/81	NIEG800134	This study will observe and compare the responses of inner-city kindergarten children to two philosophically different curricular approaches to reading readiness.
Fritz Machlup Princeton, NJ	20,000	8/80 - 7/81	NIEG800158	The grantee will produce a volume which presents a comprehensive overview of education in the United States today. The volume will be part of a series entitled Knowledge: Its Creation, Distribution and Economic Significance.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.*	DESCRIPTION
*Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc. (AEL) Charleston, WV	$1,204,846 462,554	12/80 - 11/81	400800101 NIEG800101	AEL's mission is to improve education and educational opportunity for those who live in the laboratory's primarily nonurban region. The lab provides two major types of service: dissemination and short-term regional services, such as technical assistance in response to the immediate needs of the lab's constituency; and long-term (3- to 5-year) research and demonstration activities in specific substantive areas identified as high priority by the region's educators and citizens. At present the lab's long-term research is in basic skills, school-family relations, lifelong learning for adults, and pupil behavior problems.
*CEMREL, Inc. St. Louis, MO	2,566,567 132,935	12/80 - 11/81	400800102 NIEG800102	CEMREL's primary mission is to improve the effectiveness of instruction in its region's schools by: the development and application of curricula and instructional systems based upon relevant research in the social and behavioral sciences; systematic instructional analysis by scholars in the major content areas; the application of systems analysis and planning to the development of curricula, and the organization and management of instruction; careful assessment of individual learners and learning outcomes; and the use of new and promising instructional technology. With its NIE funds, CEMREL conducts projects on mathematics, arts and humanities, urban education, training for women and minorities, teaching strategies, and dissemination.
*Center for Education Policy and Management (CEPM) University of Oregon Eugene, OR	600,000	12/80 - 11/81	NIEG800110	CEPM's mission is the conduct, synthesis, and dissemination of research directed toward improving the performance of elementary and secondary schools through the use of policy and management tools. This center has recently sharpened its mission to focus more directly on the effects of administrative policies and management practices on the conduct of education. Much of its current effort is devoted to laying out the connections between policy, management, and outcomes. This effort requires review of the literature on: student outcomes and instructional processes; teacher behavior and how it is shaped by such immediate factors as curriculum, instructional technology, work resources, and incentives; facets of organization and administration that shape those immediate factors; and the broad setting of community preferences, governance, and professional expectations within which local education takes place. This intensive review will produce a research agenda for the Center and should stimulate scholars elsewhere as well.

*Although the labs are funded by contract, they also receive grants for institutional support.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
*Center for Social Organization of Schools (CSOS) Johns Hopkins University Baltimore, MD	$1,300,000	12/80 - 11/81	NIEG800113	CSOS's mission is to produce useful knowledge on how changes in the structure and organization of schools influence student learning, attitudes, and success in adult roles. To carry out its mission, the center is organized into four programs, each of which focuses on a specific class of outcomes and a particular level of educational organization. The School Organization Program studies variation in the structure of classrooms and schools and their effects on immediate student outcomes, such as academic achievement and aspirations. The School Processes/Career Development Program examines schools and school systems and their effects on long-term student outcomes, such as higher education, careers, and job satisfaction. The School Desegregation Program studies school organization in relation to immediate outcomes (positive student relations, minority academic achievement) and long-term consequences (social mobility of minorities). The Delinquency and School Environment Program examines the relationship of the social organization of schools and in-school and later-life delinquency. Another program brings in young women and minority researchers for a year of collegial work with the Center's research staff.
*Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) University of California Los Angeles, CA	975,000	12/80 - 11/81	NIEG800112	CSE's mission focuses on education testing and evaluation. Using diverse social science frameworks, CSE conducts research on the use of evaluation and testing information in educational settings from the preschool through the university. CSE's goals include the identification of conditions under which evaluation and test information lead to improved educational programs and the generation of improved statistical and testing methods. Much of CSE's work in information use and educational improvement has focused on issues facing educators at the state and local levels. Recent CSE research concentrates on new and more valid ways of testing literacy and writing ability. Other research projects are studying such fundamental issues as fairness and validity of tests and the costs and benefits of testing and evaluation programs at the Federal, state, and local levels. A program of basic research to pinpoint indicators of school effectiveness is currently under development.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
*Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (FWL) San Francisco, CA	$2,319,986 430,000	12/80 - 11/81	400800103 NIEG800103	FWL's mission is to contribute to improvement in the quality of learning experiences that support the values and functions of a humanistic society. FWL carries out this mission by conducting four types of activities: (1) the production of new knowledge through research; (2) programmatic development leading to new high-quality products or processes that will serve the needs of all learners, with particular attention to programs concerned with processes of quality teaching and learning, use of the outcomes of educational research and development, education as it relates to work, and education for a pluralistic society; (3) technical assistance in support of quality education for those who seek or need such service; and (4) the maintenance of an impartial environment where educational issues can be confronted and assessed.
*Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance (IFG) Stanford University Stanford, CA	1,224,000	12/80 - 11/81	NIEG800111	IFG's mission focuses on the origins, implementation, and consequences of different finance and governance arrangements in the educational sector. The center conducts basic and applied research on the fiscal, political, legal, and organizational processes of elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education in the public and private sectors. In particular, the equity and efficiency implications of various finance and governance arrangements are addressed through programs on categorical grants in education, alternative structures of governance, and law and education. The center provides information to a wide audience of Federal, state, and local practitioners and policymakers on such topics as financing special education, the impact of tax and expenditure limitations on educational services, the consolidation of Federal grants, bilingual education programs, and tuition tax credits.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
*Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC) University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA	$2,626,520	12/80 - 11/81	NIEG800114	LRDC's research addresses two topics: the processes of learning and the processes of schooling. Pervading both lines of work is a common theme, a concern with understanding how knowledge and skill are acquired in various school content areas. Research on the processes of learning focuses on understanding the nature and development of expertise within and across school subject matter areas, including reading, mathematics, science, and general learning skills. Research on the processes of schooling is concerned with understanding the contexts within which school learning occurs; that is, the ways in which school and family variables influence the learning process. The work on schooling includes three sets of activities: a program of research on social learning, a program of research on how natural variations in schooling processes affect learning, and the development and testing of an educational model which puts into practice the center's ideas about facilitating learning.
*Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL) Kansas City, MO	614,586 126,391	12/80 - 11/81	A80800104 NIEG800104	McREL's mission is to improve educational practice in its region, with particular attention to those who traditionally have received a poorer quality of education than the general population. The primary beneficiaries of McREL's work are: minorities; the handicapped; those in small, isolated, or rural schools; and women. To achieve this mission, McREL employs three strategies for increasing and improving the use by practitioners of research and experience-based knowledge: knowledge dissemination and utilization, the development of knowledge about educational practice in the region, and development of the capabilities of individuals and organizations in the region to receive and use knowledge for practice improvement.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
*National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) Boulder, CO	$1,543,332 47,350	12/80 - 11/81	400800109 NIEG800109	NCHEMS's mission is to improve planning and management in colleges, universities, and state agencies of higher education through research, development, and assistance activities. The center is organized into five programs. The Planning and Financing Program is developing methods of strategic planning for institutions to use in the current environment of declining resources, as well as conducting research on new state funding formulas that are based on principles of marginal cost. The Information for Management Program is developing a series of indicators of the status of higher education in such areas as the costs to students of going to college, student retention and academic preparedness, student participation in different types of postsecondary education, and the state financing of higher education. Organizational Studies is a new program of basic research on decision-making processes in institutions of postsecondary education. The Management Development program provides training for administrators in management techniques and leadership through a summer institute and through shorter seminars. The National Resources Program complements these program activities through providing resources for visiting scholars and interns, and for planning and evaluating the center's programs.
*National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE) Ohio State University Columbus, OH	1,236,102	12/80 - 11/81	NIEG800115	NCRVE is conducting a four-year research program on employability that will describe and analyze the various sectors of society that prepare youth for employment. The purpose is to arrive at recommendations on how to efficiently and equitably assist youth in developing employability competencies. The research is organized into three projects: (1) study of linkages between educators and employers that is focused on how well educational goals match employment requirements, (2) study of factors that consistently place some youth at high risk of school failure and persistent unemployment, and (3) study of approaches to assessing and documenting the employment competencies of youth. A final project is the Resource and Referral Service, which is developing a data base of available educational information resources.

82-574 O—81——13

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
*Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) Portland, OR	$3,179,155 128,845	12/80 - 11/81	400800105 NIEG800105	NWREL's mission is to assist education, government, community agencies, business, and labor in improving quality and equality in educational programs and processes by: developing and disseminating effective educational products and procedures; conducting research on educational needs and problems; providing technical assistance in educational problem-solving; evaluating effectiveness of educational programs and projects; providing training in educational planning, management, evaluation, and instruction; and serving as an information resource on effective educational programs and processes. With its NIE funding, the lab conducts projects on functional literacy, Indian reading and language studies, evaluation, applied performance testing, education and work, multicultural in-service training, training for women and minorities, rural education, regional research and development services, dissemination, competency-based education, and computer technology.
*Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) Philadelphia, PA	2,323,060 309,095	12/80 - 11/81	400800106 NIEG800106	RBS's mission is to apply the results of educational research and development in improving elementary and secondary schools in its region. The lab works at the state and intermediate levels to provide information and training in the design and implementation of state-initiated school improvement programs. It works with local schools to build staff skills in planning, implementing, disseminating, and evaluating improvement programs. In basic skills, the emphasis is on turning research into practical day-to-day procedures for increasing student reading and math achievement. In career preparation, schools and communities are assisted in building capability to help youth people decide about careers. The Regional Exchange program supplies research-based information and technical assistance to state-initiated school improvement programs. Evaluation Services offers assistance to agencies desiring to assess the effects of their programs, while Field Studies contributes to an understanding of how schools change and can be helped to improve.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
*Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (RDCTE) University of Texas Austin, TX	$1,512,000	12/80 - 11/81	NIEG800116	RDCTE's mission is to conduct research and related activities in close collaboration with practitioners, policymakers, and researchers at all levels in the field of teacher education. The center aims to increase the validated knowledge bases underlying effective teaching and learning and successful implementation of research-based practices in a variety of settings. Specific research initiatives are focused on areas of major concern to practitioners in public schools and colleges. The center's projects include: research designed to increase knowledge bases regarding the effects of various kinds of teachers and teaching on various important dimensions of learning by students with different ackgrounds, characteristics, and previous achievements; research on the effects of teacher education programs and practices on teachers; and research on the support and delivery systems required to assure high-quality implementation of research-validated practices by teachers and teacher educators who have differing concerns, characteristics, previous experience, and current perspectives.
*Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) Austin, TX	1,534,999 115,001	12/80 - 11/81	400800107 NIEG800107	SEDL's mission is to promote quality learning in its region by conducting research, developing educational products, and assisting other educational institutions. These activities address three broad goals: (1) meeting the educational needs of special populations, such as those with unique language or cultures, physical or mental exceptionality or functional competency; (2) understanding and studying the conditions that influence learning and schooling both in and out of the school setting; and (3) linking potential users, such as teachers or state departments of education, with tested cost-effective educational products or strategies.
*Southwest Regional Laboratory (SWRL) Los Alamitos, CA	1,922,558 124,851	12/80 - 11/81	400800108 NIEG800108	SWRL's mission is to develop fundamental, significant improvements in education and to conduct educational research in order to solve the problems and serve the needs of the public and private schools, colleges, and universities in its region. With its NIE funding, the lab conducts projects on operational quality and equality in education, basic skills instruction, bilingual-bicultural education, and participatory research and development.

AWARDEE	FY 1980 AMOUNT	PERIOD COVERED BY AWARD	CONTRACT/ GRANT NO.	DESCRIPTION
*Wisconsin Research and Development Center for Individual Schooling (WRDCIS) University of Wisconsin Madison, WI	$2,048,180	12/80 - 11/81	NIEG800117	WRDCIS has redefined its mission to focus on student diversity and the implications of diversity for schooling. Moving beyond an earlier focus on individual psychological differences and the individualization of teaching to respond to them, the center is now exploring the major dimensions along which students differ and which are important to teaching and school management. Research programs deal with: differences in student learning and development, especially development of language proficiencies and other basic skills; differences in the response of students to various classroom processes and teaching techniques; differences in students which require schools to manage and allocate resources to meet the needs of various groups; and differences in students which result in Federal, state, or local mandates to provide specialized services, often compounding the demands on local classrooms. The center's goal is to locate those differences among students which are most important to education, and to explain how these differences can be met most efficiently and effectively by local schools.

OCT

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

September 19, 1981

The Honorable Austin J. Murphy
Subcomittee on Select Education
617 House Office Building Annex #1
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Murphy:

Enclosed is my response to follow-up questions from your staff that pertain to the June 18 hearings on priorities for funding the National Institute for Education. I have also included an analysis of N.I.E. studies prepared by one of my colleagues. Since Drs. Emans, Walker, and I have expertise in reading, I felt it would be useful for you to receive information from a senior professor who is an authority in another area of education.

Because I needed to spend my vacation working to meet a deadline with one of my publishers, I asked Judy Wagner of your staff if I might respond to your questions in September. She said that would be acceptable.

The delay has been quite useful in helping me more fully understand the problems of N.I.E. After reading the reports and other correspondence of Dr. Emans and Dr. Walker, I became more informed regarding the serious waste of research funds. I then called or wrote to other respected scholars in Reading to obtain their views. Dr. George Spache (Florida), Dr. Walter Hill (New York), Dr. Eldon Ekwall (Texas), and Dr. Leo Schell (Kansas) all strongly expressed negative views of the uses to which our federal funds have been put in the area of reading research. Dr. Emans summarized the problem when he said that fifty years of research in reading has been ignored.

In addition, I reiterate my plea for more careful auditing. This summer I was given a copy of a resume that was sent to N.I.E. as part of a proposal, recently funded. In the resume, this person claimed to have earned degrees at three different institutions. This information is false. People who know I have testified on funding for N.I.E. ask me why nothing is done about instances such as this. When I suggest that they give information, they express fears for the safety of their jobs. One can hardly fail to be sympathetic to them. The responsibility for auditing does belong with a federal agency. Misrepresentation of credentials, nepotism, misuse of travel funds, and the practice of paying people from N.I.E. funds while they are pursuing other commercial interests are violations that are often common knowledge, but not often reported.

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

I am hopeful that abuses in the use of N.I.E. funds can be corrected so that N.I.E.'s better projects can continue to receive the enthusiastic support they deserve.

Sincerely,

Lois A. Bader
Professor

LAB:rph

Q1. When and how did you first develop a concern about the research being supported through NIE? Could you give more specific illustrations of problems you have seen?

A. I first became concerned about the research supported by NIE when I discovered that large sums of money were being given to people to conduct research in areas in which they had no academic preparation or experience. I discovered that many relatives and friends were hired on projects when there were more qualified people available.

When I attended a meeting on research in beginning reading instruction at the University of Pittsburgh, I heard participants, whose remarks were taped and recorded by a stenographer, admit that they didn't know how their research applied to beginning reading instruction, and that they were there because of people they knew in NIE and in NIE-funded projects. People presenting papers seemed to have no knowledge of the huge amount of research completed in beginning reading instruction. They seemed to disregard everyone outside their circle. There was no understanding of the needs of teachers and the children they were instructing.

As Drs. Emans and Walker have given specific instances of deficiencies in the published studies in reading, it would be redundant for me to do so. However, I, too, became aware of problems when I heard the NIE research in reading presented at conferences and when I read published accounts.

Finally, colleagues became so outraged by some of the NIE-sponsored research that they posted it on the walls of our college with derogatory statements. One study was read aloud in a faculty meeting while listeners laughed. A professor in Kansas told me he subscribed to a newsletter of one of the NIE-sponsored institutes. He said he and his colleagues agreed that if the researchers wanted answers to many of the questions they were pursuing, they should call and ask them. He felt the questions were the type asked by professors who had never been classroom teachers. In many instances, I know this to be true.

Q2. In your testimony you mentioned narrow studies focused on four to six teachers. What was the purpose of the studies to which you refer? Was there any effort to replicate these projects in larger populations? Was there any effort to apply the results of this research in the general population?

A. One study that I had in mind involved observations of six teachers (not their students, as Dr. Goldberg suggested). These six were asked to fill out questionnaires. The published findings were summarized with this statement: "If teachers regard a school subject as important, they allocate more time to it than other subjects."

I don't know if there are any plans to replicate this finding. (If there are, it would be a tremendous waste of money.) Nor do I know of plans to apply this finding.

I was sorry that Dr. Goldberg mentioned research I was involved in years ago in an NIE-sponsored institute, because I had hoped to avoid discussing the work in my college. I left the project, even though I had put a great deal of effort into it, because I was appalled by its quality.

To describe all of the shortcomings of this work would require many pages. I will mention a few problems that illustrate my concerns.

Dr. Goldberg stated that the intent of these studies was to study "thinking and decision-making among expert reading diagnosticians." Who were these experts? They were friends and acquaintances of the investigators. What were their qualifications? Our Master's degree in reading requires six courses in reading. One of the subjects had taken three courses. Some had never been employed as reading diagnosticians.

Whom did these "experts" diagnose? We put together large boxes of data, mostly tapes and test results, that simulated children with reading difficulties. Much of this was invented; for example, some of the tests were never given to the children, and the tapes were made by high-achieving children acting the part of disabled readers. Each subject diagnosed three cases, one of which was a replication. The subjects never saw the children.

The plan I had hoped to follow entailed telling the subjects that we had information on disabled readers, and that they were to ask for information they wanted. This way, we might learn what information was collected, in what order, and how it was interpreted by reading teachers. However, the subjects were given a list of everything in the box, resulting in their asking for a great deal of information they did not usually collect. The findings were almost useless. Half of the subjects recognized that they were reviewing replicated cases. This, also, confounded results. Subjects were pressed constantly to talk about everything they saw. This is very distracting to some people who are trying to think. We were not getting information that reflected the usual practices of these people.

In another study on this project, subjects who had seen the cases were observed talking about the cases with subjects who had not yet seen them.

I left the project. Two years ago, another reading professor who had replaced me left the project, citing the same problems with research quality that I had found, and complaining that the data did not reflect the thinking and decision-making of reading teachers. He, too, did not want his name associated with this research. In a field where credit for research is important, this is significant.

Response to Q2., continued

In one of the studies that Dr. Goldberg mentioned, Weinshank used the procedures described above to look at recommendations for remediation of reading difficulties. Based on a study of only eight subjects, she said, "The near-chaotic state of diagnosis and remediation cannot go unchallenged." This and statements like it are hardly the reasoned, qualified statements one expects in scientific research. These are emotional ravings that can do harm to reading teachers.

Q3. How can NIE better disseminate information to assure that the results of educational research can be applied in classrooms?

A. There is no need for NIE to be involved in research dissemination beyond ERIC.

When research is conducted on important questions, when research procedures are sound, when the investigators are respected, and when the reports are written in readable language, the findings rapidly sweep through the educational community! Existing communication channels include: undergraduate and graduate courses; inservice sessions in schools; professional seminars for administrators; newsletters, bulletins, and journals of professional associations, colleges, and state, regional, and city school systems; textbooks; conference reports; and, of course, ERIC.

Needless to say, efforts to disseminate poor research, research that repeats what is known, or research that deals with such trivia that people laugh at it would be a tremendous waste of money.

Q4. Do you see any advantage to centralized centers for education research such as the Regional Education Laboratories and the Research and Demonstration Centers?

A. I don't see any advantage to having a few centralized centers over having several smaller projects. The probability of making useful discoveries increases with the involvement of people with diverse backgrounds. Also, there are likely to be fewer abuses with regard to the misuse of funds and the networking of a relatively small clique. It seems to me that NIE has been unable to monitor the use of funds in large centers.

Q5. Would the elimination of the 40% set-aside for the Labs and Centers, in your opinion, solve some of the problems you see?

A. Yes, I agree that the elimination of the 40% set-aside is desirable.

Q6. In the letter following your testimony you give an example of duplication of textbook studies by citing the Michigan Social Studies Textbook Study and you refer to another study cited during the hearings which is a replication of other numerous studies. Would you please tell us specifically to which study you refer and of which previous studies it is a replication?

A. Two NIE-supported studies were mentioned as important breakthroughs in the June 18 hearings. This is especially ironic since both of them are in areas where extensive research has been done.

1. Readability of textbooks, cited by Richard Anderson.

Since I have a full teaching load, and I don't have the millions of dollars in federal funds available to me that Dr. Anderson has, I can only cite a few examples that are illustrative of much work in this area.

In March, 1967, Walter Hill wrote "Research in the Classroom: Content Textbook -- Help or Hindrance." This Journal of Reading article cited 23 references in a review of research related to readability of content area textbooks with implications for classroom instruction.

In December, 1968, the entire issue of The Reading Teacher was devoted to articles and research on reading materials. The distinguished researcher, Earl Rankin, co-authored one of the articles, "A Methodology for Studying Children's Reactions to Stories in First Grade Readers."

Since this time, numerous studies have been published. Many of them are quite sophisticated. They are not limited to simple-minded rewrites of stories or archaic readability formulas, as indicated in the testimony given before your committee.

In addition to the voluminous literature on the comprehensibility of texts, there have been other extremely valuable sources of information. One is the Educational Products Information Exchange (EPIE). This institute was created as an independent, non-profit, non-governmental organization designed to provide descriptive and evaluative information about educational materials and products. The first issue of The EPIE Forum was published in 1967.

The Select Committee was provided with two copies of the Michigan Social Studies Textbook Study, 1978-79. The Michigan Department of Education has for several years involved scholars and textbook publishers in analyzing textbooks and making recommendations for their improvement. These studies are published in ERIC. There are projects such as these in other state departments of education, county school-district offices, and public school systems. It would be interesting to compare the cost of producing this information in an NIE-funded center with other state and local efforts. Certainly, there is no comparison with the cost of regular reviews of textbooks and studies of the comprehensibility of texts in scholarly journals. A few examples: Science Education, School Science and Mathematics, Social Education, and English Journal.

Dr. Goldberg said, "The Michigan study is concerned with race, culture, and gender in four published textbooks. In contrast, the CSR research on social studies texts deals with coherence, intelligibility, and the degree to which they organize material for ease of comprehension."

How can Dr. Goldberg misrepresent the Michigan studies when a copy is in the hands of the committee?! The '78-'79 study was concerned with social studies series from four major publishers, and included a large number of textbooks. Even more important, the Michigan studies have been concerned "with coherence, intelligibility, and the degree to which they organize material for ease of comprehension." I am attaching a copy of the chart Dr. Marich from

Response to Q6., continued

The University of Michigan and I used in our analysis. I don't understand how anyone could look at the study and miss this large, important component. Furthermore, the '78-'79 text study is only one of several conducted by the Michigan Department of Education.

2. The other research designated as an impo-tant breakthrough was cited by the administrator from the New York Public Schools, representing Dr. Macchiarola. I do not have a copy of his oral testimony, but he mentioned the Brookover-Lezotte study. Since these people and I are on the same faculty, I am not eager to critique their research. In paper #17 from the Institute for Research on Teaching, they describe their work in eight schools in which they used questionnaires with items such as, "Has staff morale changed in the school during the past three years?" Anyone seriously concerned with research methodology in this area should read "Telling More Than We Can Know: Verbal Reports on Mental Processes," by R.E. Nesbett and T.R. Wilson, Psychological Review, May, 1977. Dr. Brookover has had some former students employed in the New York Schools who think well of him. I, too, think well of Dr. Brookover. A question remains as to whether the findings are new.

In the 1920s, the Rand Corporation sponsored research to identify factors that contribute significantly to high achievement in schools. These findings have been replicated many times. One of the studies that I have shared with my classes over the years was reported widely by George Weber, Council for Basic Education, Washington, D.C., 1971. The title is "Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools." Two of the schools were P.S. 11, Manhattan, and P.S. 129, Manhattan. One might assume New York City school administrators would be familiar with this and several other studies completed in their district, and that they would be aware of whether or not the findings were the same or were new. The findings of this study were reported in journals and the newspapers. William Raspberry discussed the study in his widely syndicated column.

Dr. Goldberg states, "Results of NIE-supported research suggest that inner-city schools can be effective in teaching poor and minority students, and that such effective schools have principals who are strong instructional leaders, professional staffs with high expectations for pupil performance... orderly school climates...testing and assessment systems...".

The Weber report (1971) listed the following factors that accounted for success in the inner-city schools: "strong leadership, high expectations, good atmosphere...careful evaluation of pupil progress."

The fact that Dr. Goldberg cited the preceding as an example of the value of NIE research concerns me. Surely, knowledgeable NIE staff know better.

Unlike Dr. Goldberg, I do not have a staff to help me construct answers to the questions I was given. However, I can recommend a publication that has an extensive bibliography of studies related to effective schools. The title of this monograph is Study of Two Inner City Schools, published by the State of New York, Office of Education Performance Review, March 1974. Ninety-two references are listed. (A study by Robert Emans is included.)

...As I write this, I am struck by the incongruity of trying to make my voice heard when I have no staff, no multi-million-dollar budget, and a relatively low-paid position as a professor which fully engages my time.

(over) - re @ 6.

CI8300/405

ASSESSING THE COMPREHENSIBILITY OF TEXTBOOKS

Lois A. Bader
Michigan State University

Factors contributing to the readability of instructional materials can be studied in various ways. The cloze procedure, described by Rankin and Culhane (1969), is desirable when students are available for testing. Readability formulae such as those developed by McLaughlin (1969) and Fry (1977) are frequently used to obtain a gross measure of level of difficulty. However, these devices do not provide a comprehensive analysis of factors teachers and curriculum leaders need to consider in an examination of text books.

In addition to keeping in mind the previous experiences and characteristics of the students who will be using the materials, text reviewers may wish to direct their attention to the following features:

1. Linguistic Factors. Written language is composed of graphemic, syntactic and semantic elements. As children mature and as they read more, their abilities to process these elements usually increase. One way to estimate reading grade level is to use a readability formula which takes into account factors such as sentence length and multisyllabic words. On the primary levels especially, consideration needs to be given to analyzing language patterns appropriate to children's oral language capabilities.

2. Conceptual Factors. The ideas presented in materials also contribute a great deal toward reading ease or difficulty. Readers use the store of concepts that they possess to understand new ideas. If they lack appropriate concepts because of immaturity or inexperience, they may not comprehend what they read even though they may be able to read aloud with apparent ease. Aspects, such as concept density, abstractness of concepts, and inadequate concept development, may affect reading ease or difficulty. Further, the representation of females, physically handicapped, racial and ethnic groups and others who have been set apart is important since readers need to be able to make a positive identification with people in the text since this, too, can affect reading achievement.

3. Organizational Factors. Writing that reflects a clear, logical development of subject matter and employs devices to highlight the organization of the presentation contributes to ease of comprehension.

4. Writing Style. While style is somewhat elusive to define, certain features of writing such as cohesiveness and word choice contribute in great measure to comprehensibility.

5. Learning Aids. Since aids to learning from reading are usually employed by authors of instructional materials and since they may contribute to comprehension, attention should be given to their potential effectiveness. These include questions or tasks that direct the reader to various levels and kinds of reasoning.

6. Teaching Aids. Instructional manuals, management plans, and tests are examples of teaching aids that might be included as part of an instructional package. These should be examined with regard to ease of use, extensiveness and quality.

7. Binding/Printing/Format/Illustrations. Pictures, charts, graphs and other illustrations may contribute to interest as well as clarification of the text. Type-face and format are factors that may influence text appeal.

The chart presented in Figure 1 specifies concerns within the seven areas briefly described in the preceding discussion. Use of the chart enables those analyzing instructional materials to reduce subjective judgments to some degree while considering a range of factors.

Figure 1 can be found on the next page.

References

Fry, Edward B. "Fry's Readability Graph: Clarifications, Validity and Extension to Level 17." Journal of Reading, Vol. 21, 1977.

McLaughlin, G. Harry. "SMOG Grading - a New Readability Formula Formula." Journal of Reading, Vol. 12, 1969.

Rankin, Earl F. and Joseph W. Culhane. "Comparable Cloze and Multiple-choice Comprehension Test Scores." Journal of Reading, Vol. 13, 1969.

Published with permission of Michigan Department of Education, 1978-79

THE MICHIGAN ENGLISH TEACHER

May 1981
Volume XXIX
Number 3

re. i Question o

Figure 1
TEXT BOOK ANALYSIS CHART

Title
Publisher
Copyright

Evident Throughout	Somewhat Evident	Not Evident		Comments
LINGUISTIC FACTORS:				
			Generally appropriate to intended grade level(s) according to formula	
			Linguistic patterns suitable to most populations and fit intended level(s)	
			Vocabulary choice and control suitable	
			New vocabulary highlighted, italicized, in boldface or underlined	
			New vocabulary, defined in context	
			New vocabulary defined in margin guides, glossary, beginning or end of chapter	
CONCEPTUAL FACTORS:				
			Conceptual level generally appropriate to intended grade level(s)	
			Concepts presented deductively	
			Concepts presented inductively	
			Major ideas are highlighted, italicized, in boldface type or underlined	
			Appropriate assumptions made regarding prior level of concepts	
			Sufficient development of new concepts through examples, illustrations, analogies, redundancy	
			No evidence of sexual, racial, economic, cultural, or political bias	
ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS:				
			Units, chapters, table of contents, index present clear, logical development of subject	
			Chapters or instructional segments contain headings and sub-headings that aid comprehension of subject	
			Introductory, definitional, illustrative, summary paragraphs/sections used as necessary	
			Topic sentences of paragraphs clearly identifiable or easily inferred	
			Each chapter/section/unit contains a well-written summary and/or overview	
WRITING STYLE:				
			Ideas are expressed clearly and directly	
			Word choice is appropriate	
			Tone and manner of expression are appealing to intended readers	
			Mechanics are correct	
LEARNING AIDS:				
			Questions/tasks appropriate to conceptual development of intended age/grade level (s)	
			Questions/tasks span levels of reasoning: literal, interpretive, critical, values clarification, problem-solving	
			Questions/tasks can be used as reading guides	
			Suitable supplementary readings suggested	
TEACHING AIDS:				
			Clear, convenient to use	
			Helpful ideas for conceptual development	
			Alternative instructional suggestions given for poor readers, slow learning students, advanced students	
			Contains objectives, management plans, evaluation guidelines, tests of satisfactory quality	
			Supplementary aids available	
BINDING/PRINTING/FORMAT/ILLUSTRATIONS:				
			Size of book is appropriate	
			Cover, binding, and paper are appropriate	
			Type-face is appropriate	
			Format is appropriate	
			Pictures, charts, graphs are appealing	
			Illustrations aid comprehension of text	
			Illustrations are free of sexual, social, cultural bias	

202

IC.1 Question 6

Figure 1
TEXT BOOK ANALYSIS CHART

Title _____
Publisher _____
Copyright _____

Evident Throughout	Somewhat Evident	Not Evident		Comments
LINGUISTIC FACTORS:				
____	____	____	Generally appropriate to intended grade level(s) according to _____ formula	____
____	____	____	Linguistic patterns suitable to most populations and fit intended level(s)	____
____	____	____	Vocabulary choice and control suitable	____
____	____	____	New vocabulary highlighted, italicized, in boldface or underlined	____
____	____	____	New vocabulary defined in context	____
____	____	____	New vocabulary defined in margin guides, glossary, beginning or end of chapter	____
CONCEPTUAL FACTORS:				
____	____	____	Conceptual level generally appropriate to intended grade level(s)	____
____	____	____	Concepts presented deductively	____
____	____	____	Concepts presented inductively	____
____	____	____	Major ideas are highlighted, italicized, in boldface type or underlined	____
____	____	____	Appropriate assumptions made regarding prior level of concepts	____
____	____	____	Sufficient development of new concepts through examples, illustrations, analogies, redundancy	____
____	____	____	No evidence of sexual, racial, economic, cultural, or political bias	____
ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS:				
____	____	____	Units, chapters, table of contents, index present clear, logical development of subject	____
____	____	____	Chapters or instructional segments contain headings and sub-headings that aid comprehension of subject	____
____	____	____	Introductory, definitional, illustrative, summary paragraphs/sections used as necessary	____
____	____	____	Topic sentences of paragraphs clearly identifiable or easily inferred	____
____	____	____	Each chapter/section/unit contains a wall-written summary and/or overview	____
WRITING STYLE:				
____	____	____	Ideas are expressed clearly and directly	____
____	____	____	Word choice is appropriate	____
____	____	____	Tone and manner of expression are appealing to intended readers	____
____	____	____	Mechanics are correct	____
LEARNING AIDS:				
____	____	____	Questions/tasks appropriate to conceptual development of intended age/grade level (s)	____
____	____	____	Questions/tasks span levels of reasoning: literal, interpretive, critical, values clarification, problem-solving	____
____	____	____	Questions/tasks can be used as reading guides	____
____	____	____	Suitable supplementary readings suggested	____
TEACHING AIDS:				
____	____	____	Clear, convenient to use	____
____	____	____	Helpful ideas for conceptual development	____
____	____	____	Alternative instructional suggestions given for poor readers, slow learning students, advanced students	____
____	____	____	Contains objectives, management plans, evaluation guidelines, tests of satisfactory quality	____
____	____	____	Supplementary aids available	____
BINDING/PRINTING/FORMAT/ILLUSTRATIONS:				
____	____	____	Size of book is appropriate	____
____	____	____	Cover, binding, and paper are appropriate	____
____	____	____	Type-face is appropriate	____
____	____	____	Format is appropriate	____
____	____	____	Pictures, charts, graphs are appealing	____
____	____	____	Illustrations aid comprehension of text	____
____	____	____	Illustrations are free of sexual, social, cultural bias	____

(over)

by Lois A Bader
MOE, 78-79 text study

CHARTERED 1693
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEAN
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA 23185

November 4, 1981

The Honorable Austin J. Murphy
Subcommittee on Select Education
617 House Office Building Annex #1
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Murphy:

Thank you for sending me Dr. Goldberg's answer to your questions regarding the National Institute of Education. I note that he included a copy of a letter he wrote to me in response to one of your questions. I think it would be appropriate, if you have not already received them, for you to have copies of the follow-up correspondence.

Sincerely,

Robert Emans

Robert Emans,
Associate Dean

REgt

encs

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20208

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

11 SEP 1981

Dr. Robert Emans
Associate Dean
College of William and Mary
School of Education
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

Dear Bob:

I appreciate your letter of August 20, 1981, further explaining your sense that the National Institute of Education should be doing more to encourage professors of educational methods to use the results of educational research in their teaching and training responsibilities.

I must say that this letter provides me with a better idea of your concerns in this area. I am not sure if I was unable to understand the issue before, or if you did not explain it very well, but in any event I believe we can probably do better. I also believe that we are doing more in this area than you imply, but I hope we can improve.

What I want to suggest is that you, and perhaps some of your colleagues at William and Mary or elsewhere in the academic world, think through a useful approach to making research products more accessible and useful to educational methodologists and submit a plan of action to our unsolicited proposal program. The closing date for the next unsolicited proposal program is next Spring, and I am asking, by copy of this letter, that the unsolicited proposal coordinator send you the new guidelines when they are published in the next few weeks.

Naturally, you will understand that since these proposals are judged by external peer reviewers, I cannot commit the agency to funding. I trust, however, that something constructive can come from our dialogue.

Sincerely,

Milton Goldberg
Acting Director